

Charles E. Hudson, Pomeroy.
Henry J. Kelley, Shannon City.
Walter L. Hurd, Stanhope.
George W. Trowbridge, Stuart.
Ella M. Hames, Williams.

MARYLAND

Edgar R. Twilley, East New Market.
Ellwood E. Matthews, Pocomoke City.
Elliott W. Marshall, Snow Hill.
George R. Bromley, Stockton.

MASSACHUSETTS

Edward F. X. Jalbert, Grafton.

MICHIGAN

Regina W. Cleary, Escanaba.

MINNESOTA

Calvin R. Bouvette, Hallock.
Cornelius W. Vahle, Tracy.
Emma C. Nuernberg, Young America.

MISSISSIPPI

Fannie L. Lowry, Houston.

MISSOURI

James G. Skidmore, Barnard.
Benjamin F. Coleman, Center.
Theo J. Quinn, St. Joseph.
H. Sam Jones, Senath.

MONTANA

Emma M. Minette, Cut Bank.
Ethel H. Burchak, Stanford.
Phyllis M. Crockford, Sweetgrass.
Thomas E. Devore, Whitehall.

NEBRASKA

Fred W. Schuman, Osceola.

NEVADA

Olive V. Corbiere, Sparks.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

George F. Garneau, Franklin.
Hugh F. Waling, Keene.

NORTH CAROLINA

Robert A. Watson, Sr., Jonesboro.
John Locke Milholland, Statesville.

NORTH DAKOTA

Albert A. Glotzbach, Anamoose.
John Urbon Pavlik, Buffalo.
Frank C. Schroeder, Leonard.
Mary Olivia Hutchison, Rhame.
Albert J. Bateson, Rolla.
Chester A. Johnson, Scranton.

OHIO

Samuel R. McGuire, Bowerston.
Earle V. Miller, Hillsboro.
Marguerite E. Martin, Monroeville.
Aaron G. Shealy, New Washington.
Loretta H. Duswald, Scio.

OKLAHOMA

Bentley R. Jones, Stilwell.

OREGON

Emil L. Mueller, Clatskanie.
Eldon A. Rush, Elgin.
Lora C. Coykendall, Oak Grove.
Louis Earl Hammer, Tillamook.

PENNSYLVANIA

Harvey F. Ecelbarger, Big Run.
Arthur W. Kinsloe, Burnham.
Michael J. Hoban, Carnegie.
Earl H. Helms, Myerstown.
Andrew T. Urda, Nemacolin.
Edward F. Lawler, Olyphant.

Paul H. Shaak, Sheridan.
Edward J. Quinn, Wilkes-Barre.
Daniel Leger, Wilmerding.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Wiley W. McTeer, Jr., Ridgeland.

TENNESSEE

Ottie H. Seaver, Church Hill.
John S. McBride, Covington.
Monie Sandschulte, Loretto.
Robert W. Simmons, Sr., Sharon.

TEXAS

Mabel Darden, Holliday.
Martha A. Davenport, Ranger.
Edwin Westbrook, Mart.
Clarence Lamoine Power, Temple.

UTAH

Ray K. Bohne, Mount Pleasant.

VERMONT

Lyman W. Sheldon, South Londonderry.

VIRGINIA

S. Thomas Nottingham, Cape Charles.
Archa Vaughan, Floyd.

WISCONSIN

Frank S. Dhooge, Ashland.
Leslie E. Sawyer, College Camp.
Harold P. Van Buren, Hartland.
Charles V. Porter, Menomonie.
Lawrence E. Astin, Milton Junction.
John W. Schnettler, St. Nazianz.
William H. Shay, Somerset.
Julius G. Behm, Woodville.

WYOMING

Orville R. Booker, Basin.
Hazel E. Moore, Edgerton.
Francis R. Peek, Glenrock.
George W. Nance, Midwest.
Cleo H. Massey, Parco.
Daniel D. Spani, Rock Springs.
Bertha I. Frolander, Sundance.

WITHDRAWAL

*Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 26
(legislative day of May 12), 1936*

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Midshipman Marvin C. Clayton to be a second lieutenant
in the Marine Corps.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 26, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William Andrew Keese, minister, Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, by whose grace our fathers laid firmly the foundations of this Republic in liberty and equality, grant unto us, their children, we beseech Thee, Thy continued favor, that we may always seek to know Thy will and to walk in Thy laws.

As our forbears subdued the wilderness and conquered the natural frontier, so may we, led by Thy spirit, transform the social frontiers of our times, that out of misunderstanding and inequality we may build the fair city of brotherhood and good will.

Lend encouragement to the strong prophetic voices which challenge us to prepare in our land a highway for our God; send wisdom and strength to all those who have the responsibility of government; and, above all, grant Thine enlighten-

ing spirit to the rank and file of our people to the end that, discerning truth from error and permanent good from temporary expediency, they may follow that manner of life which leads to security and justice for all.

Preserve in us those ancient integrities of the soul which make for peace in our borders and friendship with all the world.

In the day of our opportunity, guide Thou us to create the agencies of cooperation which shall make us all one happy nation in a family of nations. May each home be hallowed by the honor of Thy name; may the humblest of our citizens have a sense of kinship with the highest. Under the fatherhood of God, may the brotherhood of man be attained. And grant that the light of our land, shining through all the world, lead the nations to peace and prosperity, to righteousness and true success. We pray in the spirit of Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On May 18, 1936:

H. R. 10589. An act to amend section 32 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and/or completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes", approved August 30, 1935;

H. R. 10847. An act to authorize the acquisition of land for cemeterial purposes in the vicinity of New York City, N. Y.;

H. R. 12183. An act for the relief of Gladys Hinckley Werlich;

H. J. Res. 538. Joint resolution to provide for participation by the United States in the Ninth International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy in Rumania, in 1937, and to authorize and request the President of the United States to invite the International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy to hold its tenth congress in the United States in 1939, and to invite foreign countries to participate in that congress;

H. J. Res. 547. Joint resolution providing for the importation of articles free from tariff or customs duty for the purpose of exhibition at Great Lakes Exposition, to be held at Cleveland, Ohio, beginning in June 1936, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 569. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of participation by the United States in a conference at Brussels to revise the Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works concluded at Bern, September 9, 1886, and revised at Rome, June 2, 1928.

On May 19, 1936:

H. R. 2119. An act for the relief of Mrs. E. L. Babcock, mother and guardian of Nelson Babcock, a minor;

H. R. 8089. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Baylin; and

H. R. 12162. An act to create an additional division of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, to be known as the Hattiesburg division;

On May 20, 1936:

H. R. 2467. An act for the relief of Holy Cross Mission Hospital;

H. R. 5058. An act to convey certain lands to Clackamas County, Oreg., for public-park purposes;

H. R. 7110. An act to authorize the President to bestow the Navy Cross upon Brig. Gen. Robert H. Dunlap, United States Marine Corps, deceased; and

H. R. 8506. An act for the relief of Oliver Faulkner.

On May 21, 1936:

H. R. 9370. An act for the relief of Frank Cordova;

H. R. 9373. An act for the relief of H. L. & J. B. McQueen, Inc., and John L. Summers, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department;

H. R. 9455. An act for the relief of Robert J. Mann;

H. R. 10308. An act to amend article 3 of the "Rules Concerning Lights, etc.", contained in the act entitled "An act to adopt regulations for preventing collisions upon certain harbors, rivers, and inland waters of the United States", approved June 7, 1897;

H. R. 11036. An act to amend section 4321, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 263), and for other purposes;

H. R. 11302. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend to the reunion committee of the United Confederate Veterans 3,000 blankets, olive drab no. 4, 1,500 canvas cots, to be used at their annual encampment to be held at Shreveport, La., in June 1936; and

H. R. 11346. An act for the relief of H. R. Heinicke, Inc.

On May 22, 1936:

H. R. 1398. An act to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station at or near Crescent City, Calif.;

H. R. 8370. An act to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Port Washington, Wis.;

H. R. 10321. An act to amend section 4 of Public Act No. 286, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 19, 1935, as amended; and

H. R. 10544. An act authorizing the erection of a memorial to those who met their death in the wreck of the dirigible *Shenandoah*.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 11454. An act to incorporate the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the Secretary be directed to request the House to return to the Senate the bill (S. 4100) to incorporate the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 262. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into an agreement amending the agreement between such States consented to by Congress in Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 4023. An act to provide for the continuation of trading in unlisted securities upon national securities exchanges, for the registration of over-the-counter brokers and dealers, for the filing of current information and periodic reports by issuers, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12527) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 7736) entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Whitman National Monument", disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MURRAY, Mr. BENSON, and Mr. NYE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3531) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes', approved May 15, 1928", requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. COPELAND, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. McNARY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. VANDENBERG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. NORBECK members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments", for the disposition of executive papers in the Interior Department.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11418) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 304

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. RANDOLPH PERKINS, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937—MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion of the highest privilege, to instruct conferees under clause I 1-2a, rule XXVIII, section 910, of the rules of the House of Representatives, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk proceeded to read the motion.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SNELL (interrupting the reading of the motion). Mr. Speaker, as this is a very important matter, I think we should have a quorum present. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 108]

Adair	Costello	Hoeppel	Powers
Andrew, Mass.	Crowther	Huddleston	Robinson, Utah
Andrews, N. Y.	Curley	Jenckes, Ind.	Rogers, N. H.
Bacon	Dear	Johnson, W. Va.	Ryan
Barden	Dietrich	Kee	Schaefer
Berlin	Ditter	Kennedy, Md.	Schuetz
Binderup	Dockweller	Lanham	Shanley
Brennan	Driscoll	Lewis, Md.	Smith, Conn.
Brewster	Duffey, Ohio	Lundeen	Thom
Brooks	Dunn, Miss.	McFarlane	Tobey
Buckley, N. Y.	Fenerty	McGehee	Treadway
Bulwinkle	Ferguson	McGroarty	Turpin
Caldwell	Frey	McLean	Utterback
Carmichael	Goodwin	Marshall	Wearin
Cartwright	Green	Montet	Werner
Cary	Greenway	Murdock	Wigglesworth
Casey	Gwynne	Norton	Wilcox
Cavichia	Hancock, N. C.	Oliver	Wood
Chapman	Harlan	Patton	Zioncheck
Claiborne	Hennings	Peterson, Fla.	
Connery	Hill, Samuel B.	Plumley	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and forty-three Members are present, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. BANKHEAD, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PORT NEWARK ARMY SUPPLY BASE—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 497)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 9042, "An act to provide for the sale of the Fort Newark Army Supply Base to the city of Newark, N. J."

The land on which this base is located was acquired from the city of Newark in 1918 for the storage and shipment of overseas supplies at its then value of \$1,330,000. The original outlay of the Government for construction was more than \$10,000,000. Since 1924 it has been under lease, chiefly for the purpose of preserving the plant in a saleable condition.

H. R. 9042 extends a very liberal option to the city of Newark to acquire the base for what purports to be \$2,000,000, but which is in fact a donation after 20 years, with annual payments by the city of no more than reasonable rent, or 5 percent interest on the arbitrary valuation. This is a departure from previous legislation under which States, counties, and municipalities have been given preferences to acquire surplus military reservations by paying the appraised value in cash. When such properties have been sold at public sale, a down payment of 25 percent has generally been exacted with interest on the unpaid portion of the purchase price.

That part of section 1 which implies an additional consideration moving from the city in the form of maintenance of the inshore channel furnishing ingress and egress to the base is not regarded of any legal effect, as the city has previously bound itself to maintain this channel and such work will inure to the city if it becomes the owner of the base.

Section 4, which is intended to authorize the sale to others if the city does not exercise its option, is open to several objections, the more important being:

It does not give the Secretary of War any discretion in the way of terms of sale, but requires the purchase price to be paid in cash, thereby confining competition to a limited number of bidders.

Disappointed bidders are encouraged to attack any sale.

Repeated offering of the property at public sale under identical conditions is required, irrespective of the success of preceding efforts or the prevailing market, thereby creating an uncertain situation which would seriously interfere with any temporary use of the property pending its permanent disposition.

In general, the bill, in addition to being unduly liberal to the city, establishes an undesirable precedent, and its restrictions, in the event of a public sale, render an advantageous disposition improbable.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 26, 1936.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill, together with the message of the President, be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, there are several Members present who desire to submit conference reports. With the understanding that it shall not take me off the floor or be taken out of my time, I am willing that these bills be sent to conference; but with the understanding that my rights are still preserved.

The SPEAKER. It will not interfere with the gentleman's rights.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8455) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference thereon.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman's purpose merely to ask that the bill go to conference?

The SPEAKER. That is all.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WILSON of Louisiana, WHITTINGTON, GRISWOLD, RICH, and ENGLEBRIGHT.

COLLECTION OF REVENUE ON INTOXICATING LIQUOR

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to appoint three additional conferees on the bill (H. R. 9185) to insure the collection of the revenue on intoxicating liquor, to provide for the more efficient and economical administration and enforcement of the laws relating to the taxation of intoxicating liquor, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DOUGHTON, VINSON of Kentucky, and REED of New York.

INTERNAL-REVENUE LAWS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 12793) to amend certain administrative provisions of the internal-revenue laws, and for other purposes.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman tell us what bill that is?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is the bill providing for refund of taxes paid under the A. A. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 11418) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

Mr. UMSTEAD submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 12527) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937—MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the motion to instruct conferees, which is as follows:

MOTION OF THE HIGHEST PRIVILEGE

Mr. BLANTON, under paragraph 1½a, of rule XXVIII, section 910, of the rules of the House of Representatives, offered the following motion to instruct House conferees, being a motion of the highest privilege, to wit:

Moved, That managers on the part of the House, who, at the request of the Senate, were appointed by the Speaker on April 24, 1936, for a conference with the managers on the part of the Senate, who were appointed by the Senate on April 23, 1936, respecting the disagreeing votes of the two Houses relative to 87 amendments placed by the Senate on the House bill (H. R. 11581) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, have been in conference more than 20 days without avail, said House conferees having been appointed more than 20 calendar days, and have made no report to the House, that they, the said managers on the part of the House be, and they are hereby, instructed as follows:

First. The House instructs its managers to insist on the disagreement of the House to Senate amendment no. 1, which proposes to appropriate \$5,700,000 out of the United States Treasury as a Federal contribution on the local civic expenses of the District of Columbia, and to insist on the House provision appropriating \$2,700,000, it being the position of the House of Representatives that inasmuch as the tax rate on the District of Columbia was lowered in 1928 from \$1.80 on the \$100 to \$1.70 on the \$100, which remained in effect up to and including 1933; that in 1934 such tax rate was again lowered from \$1.70 on the \$100 to \$1.50 on the \$100, which rate still prevails, being the lowest rate of taxation in any comparable city in the United States; and that said 1934 reduction in rate was a saving annually to local taxpayers of \$2,445,000 in cash; that also in 1934 the Commissioners arbitrarily lowered the assessed values of real estate \$80,000,000, which was an additional saving annually to property owners of \$1,200,000; that in 1935 the Commissioners again arbitrarily lowered the assessed values of real estate \$50,000,000, which was an additional saving annually to property owners in a large amount;

that in 1935 the Commissioners gave a 25-percent reduction in water rates and at the same time granted an increase in the metered allowance of from 7,500 to 10,000 cubic feet, which meant an additional saving to property owners of \$600,000 per annum on water charges; that a discount of 10 percent also was allowed property owners on water bills for payment of same within 15 days after being due, which meant an additional saving to them of \$100,000 per year; that the local tax rate on intangible properties is only one-half of 1 percent; that the local gasoline tax is only 2 cents per gallon, while in Maryland, just a few miles from the Capitol, it is 4 cents, plus a general sales tax; and in Virginia, just a few miles from the Capitol, and in Arizona, Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, New Mexico, and the State of Washington it is 5 cents per gallon; and in the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina it is 6 cents per gallon; and in the States of Florida and Tennessee the gasoline-tax rate is 7 cents per gallon; and in the District of Columbia the tangible personal-property tax paid on many fine Packards, Cadillacs, and Pierce-Arrows, used family automobiles, is in instances as low as \$2, \$3, and \$4 per car; and the annual registration and license-tag charge is only \$1 per car, whether it is a Ford or a \$12,000 Rolls-Royce; and the annual average charge for water per average family is only \$6.60 per year; and each family has exempt from tax \$1,000 of household furniture; and each citizen has exempt from tax his private library, whether worth \$5 or \$50,000; and each person has exempt from tax all wearing apparel, whether worth \$5 or \$50,000; and there is no charge made on residences for gathering ashes, or gathering trash, or gathering garbage; and no charge is made to contiguous property owners for repairing and repaving sidewalks or for repairing and repaving streets; and there is furnished without charge to all property owners shade and ornamental trees around their property, and the fencing that protect the first years of early growth, the pruning, caring for, spraying, and replacing of them; and there is no annual charge made for sewer service; and there is no local bonded indebtedness with annual interest to pay, because in years gone by the United States Government paid one-half of all the Capital construction expense of paving streets, building bridges, jails, penitentiary, courthouses, municipal buildings, water system, sewer system, 150 schools, parks, and playgrounds, hospitals, and other improvements; and after once paying it out of debt the United States has kept the District of Columbia out of debt; and that outside of the regular Federal taxes the people of all cities everywhere pay, there is in the District of Columbia no estate tax, no inheritance tax, no gift tax, no income tax, and no sales tax; and that in his testimony every fact hereinbefore asserted was admitted to be true by Commissioner Hazen, the President of the Board of Commissioners, who testified that the people of the District of Columbia are better cared for, are the least taxed, and have greater privileges than any other people in the United States; and the Washington Board of Trade having advertised in the Washington Star on April 26, 1936, that during the last 5 years visitors to Washington had spent in Washington the huge sum of \$221,547,992, which resulted from the Government's institutions being located in Washington, and inures to the benefit of local residents here, it being the position of the House that under such circumstances, while citizens of Washington are taxed less than citizens of any other comparable city in the United States, it would be unjust and inequitable for the people residing in the States to be taxed to pay more than \$2,700,000 as an annual contribution to the expenses of the taxpayers of the District of Columbia.

Second. The House instructs its managers to insist on the disagreement of the House to the amendment of the Senate appropriating \$78,660 for so-called character education, the House having refused to allow same, and it being the position of the House that the \$63,385 appropriated in the 1935 bill for so-called character education was wasted and perverted, and that the \$89,540 appropriated in the 1936 bill has been wasted and perverted, there being no attempt to establish said character education in but 10 of the 175 schools of the District of Columbia, and that no good whatever but harm has been accomplished by the experiment, and as unanimously recommended by the subcommittee, which held an exhaustive hearing on the subject, the Committee on Appropriations in its bill and report refused to appropriate the \$4,400 for an assistant superintendent in charge, \$17,460 salaries for 12 clerks, and \$56,800 salaries of 22 research assistants and counselors, and refused to appropriate said \$78,660, and recommended the elimination of all funds for so-called character education, and said committee in its report unanimously recommended that the Board of Education should take immediate steps to eliminate from the public schools all communistic books and magazines.

Third. The House instructs its managers to insist on the disagreement of the House to Senate amendment no. 83, which struck from the House bill the following—

"Sec. 6. No part of the funds appropriated in this act shall be available for the payment of the salary of any officer or employee of the District of Columbia whose salary as such officer or employee is \$2,400 or more per annum who is engaged in any outside business or profession in addition to his official duties,"—

and to insist on said House provision, it being the position of the House that judges getting salaries of \$8,000, \$10,000, and \$12,000 per annum, and that attorneys getting salaries up to \$8,000 per annum, and that doctors getting salaries up to \$7,500 per annum, ought to apply themselves and give their time to their official duties, and ought not to neglect their duties by accepting outside employment.

Mr. SNELL (interrupting the reading of the motion). Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the motion which the Clerk is reading is a motion to instruct the conferees. It seems to me that there is contained in this motion the argument on one side at least. Is that proper in a motion to instruct conferees?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I may say this motion is drawn as the basis for the action of the House in instructing its conferees, to show that the House is not acting arbitrarily, but, on the contrary, has reason for thus instructing its conferees. If the gentleman from New York will listen to the next two instructions he will see they are very specific as to instructing the conferees, and the Clerk is about to read those two sections.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, in order to get a ruling of the Chair, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Texas in his motion has gone far beyond what is intended to be placed in a motion to instruct conferees.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the motion ought to be read first, so that the Chair may know the full context of the motion before a ruling is made. The Chair may say further that the rule under which this motion is offered would not ordinarily carry with it an argument.

Mr. SNELL. That is my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The difficulty is that one presiding officer may look at a certain motion in one way and another presiding officer look at it in another way. The Chair does not feel that he should be called upon to censor a motion offered by a Member of the House under the rules.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, there can be no question in regard to this motion. The whole argument is being presented in the original motion.

The SPEAKER. If the Chair sustained the point of order made by the gentleman from New York, it would be necessary for the Chair to use a pencil and strike out the portion of the motion which occurs to the Chair as being argument; but, as previously stated, another presiding officer might take a different view of the matter. It seems to the Chair that, after all, it is a matter for the House to determine in the final analysis.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAVERICK. When argumentation is included in a motion of this kind, if we vote favorably on it, we agree in effect to the various and sundry argumentative statements included therein. We are entitled to vote on a motion which clearly sets forth the instructions to the conferees and, when there is a large mass of argumentation in there, we are being placed in the position of agreeing to the argumentation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] that is a matter of argument.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOTT. Inasmuch as we have listened to about 15 minutes of argument in this motion, may I inquire whether it would be proper in calculating the time of the gentleman from Texas to deduct this 15 minutes from his time?

The SPEAKER. No; it will not be taken out of his time. The gentleman is entitled to 1 hour when the reading of the motion is completed.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the motion.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the conferees of the House are nothing in the world but the servants of the House, and as such servants of the House they do the bidding of the House and carry out the wishes of the House. That is all on earth the conferees in this case want to do. Whatever this House instructs them to do they stand ready and willing to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, containing 83 pages, was before this House under general debate for 3 days. A motion was made on the floor to amend the provision having to do with the lump-sum feature of the

bill enlarging it to \$5,700,000. A vote was taken in this House, and only 11 Members, as shown by the RECORD, supported this motion. Out of a membership of 435 Members, only 11 voted for a lump-sum contribution out of the Federal Treasury of \$5,700,000.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Permit me to finish my statement. I cannot yield now. If the gentleman will allow me to proceed I may yield later. Mr. Speaker, that motion failed, and that 83-page bill was not amended in a single particular. There was not one single amendment placed upon it. In order to register their opposition to the cut in the lump-sum and the other provisions some did not like in the bill, and to indicate the combined opposition as against all of its provisions, there was a roll call in the House on the passage of the bill, and upon that roll call there were only 26 Members who registered opposition to the bill in any particular.

The bill then went over to the Senate. There were 87 Senate amendments placed in the bill, some of them involving hundreds of thousands of dollars, and six legislative items. For instance, the House committee was convinced it was necessary to build a new Chain Bridge. The Budget had not authorized this item. But outside of the Budget the House committee voted unanimously to grant \$350,000 to build a new Chain Bridge, which was exactly the amount the Commissioners asked for, and it was the amount the Commissioners said they needed. They did not need any more. The Senate added \$100,000 to this item over the objection of the Commissioners. Colonel Sultan, Engineer Commissioner, said they did not want it and said they did not need it, but nevertheless the Senate added another \$100,000.

There are six legislative items included in the bill that have not been sent to a legislative committee for consideration. For instance, there is a legislative amendment in there to establish pay parking meters all over the Nation's Capital. Whenever a person stopped an automobile on the public streets of the Nation's Capital they would have to dig up money to put into the slot of this parking meter.

This parking meter is owned by one big corporation of the United States. This is to make the people of the Nation who have automobiles every time they park their car pay tribute to one big corporation or monopoly in the United States.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute.

Mr. MICHENER. Is there anything like that in this motion?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly, it is involved in the conference. If the gentleman will not interrupt me I think I can get along much faster.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas declines to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. There are 87 Senate amendments involved here in this conference. We are asking for instructions on three important ones, but all 87 are in conference. Before this House ever appointed conferees, Mr. Speaker—before the bill ever went to conference—a statement was in the press from the Senate chairman that this was one time that the House conferees would have to accede to every one of the propositions of the Senate or there would be no bill; and when your conferees went to conference the managers on the part of the House found that situation prevailed—that unless we would agree to all the Senate conditions there would be no bill. They said a continuing resolution would be passed giving them what they wanted in the way of a lump-sum appropriation and if we attempted to amend the continuing resolution they would make the President furnish funds out of relief—a ridiculous proposition.

Your House managers did everything in the world to try to get a bill. Under these circumstances we did not want to leave the District without funds. We knew there were needed projects there that ought to be built and in order to try to get a bill, although we knew that lots of these propositions were not sound and that they should not be passed, we proposed to the Senate that if they would recede on just

three amendments, the House managers would recede on 84; in other words, the House managers would bow down and recede on 84 Senate amendments if the Senate conferees would recede on just 3, and they would not do it. They would not accept our generous proposal. They demanded their pound of flesh and demanded that the House should knuckle down to them."

I now want to show, Mr. Speaker, that there is ample authority, justice, and basis for everything that is contained in this motion as read by the clerk.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just a moment in order that we may clarify the pending issue before the House?

Mr. BLANTON. I have this statement in my mind—

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have this in my mind, if the gentleman please, and I am trying to assist the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to my majority leader, whom I follow and try to help all the time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman's resolution is rather lengthy and I thought rather argumentative, but despite that, kindly state what your instructions are in this resolution and on what particular issue.

Mr. BLANTON. We are asking first that the House give us instructions to insist on a disagreement to the Senate amendment no. 1 to take \$5,700,000 out of the Public Treasury to give to the people of the District. That is instruction no. 1.

We are asking next that the House instruct us to stand by the House bill that was passed, with only 26 votes against it, not to allow \$78,660 to be appropriated for so-called character education, which your committee, after hearings, unanimously decided was used wastefully, without any good cause, and used in a perverted manner to put communism in our schools. That is the second instruction we want the House to give us.

We are also asking the House to instruct us to stand by the House bill with respect to a provision which affects only the employees of the District who are paid out of this bill, instructing us to stand by the House action in preventing these little municipal and police-court judges who get \$8,000 a year and these high-salaried prosecuting attorneys here who get as high as \$8,000 a year, from taking outside employment in one, two, three, or four law schools here at a time lecturing at night, when they ought to be attending to their judicial duties. We are asking instructions on that point. These are the three items, and when we get definite instructions on them and when we go to conference with the Senate, we can tell the Senate something and we will not have to sit there like a bunch of helpless mockingbirds with the Senate telling us what we have to do in order to get a bill. We can then place the responsibility on the Senate.

Now, the papers here have misrepresented this whole matter. They misrepresented the Speaker the other day. They said the Speaker had suggested they could get rid of the House conferees by making a motion to discharge. The Speaker made no such suggestion to the press and the press knows it. They also said the President was going to take a dish in this and force us to give \$5,700,000, when they knew the President had not done any such thing. Why, I am as good a friend as the President ever had, but if my President were to so far forget himself as to make an attempt to tell this Congress what it had to do about appropriations, I would quit him in a minute. I would not stand by a President who would invade the rights of this House when the executive and the legislative branches of Government are separate and distinct. Our President is too wise to make such a statement. The President did not make that statement and the press knows it.

This is an important matter and I want to call your attention to what Commissioner Hazen, who is the president of the Board of Commissioners, said about this tax matter.

Mr. MAPES, one of our splendid Members of Congress, diligent and efficient, after a long hearing and following a long investigation, as the head of a special committee of Congress, brought on this floor four bills known as the Mapes bills.

One was an increase in the tax on gasoline from 2 to 3 cents. Was that unreasonable? No. The other was an increase on the automobile charge where a Rolls-Royce costing \$12,000 is taxed only \$1 for license tax each year the same as a Ford, there being \$1 tax on all automobiles. The bill provided for a proper tax on automobiles and trucks.

Another Mapes bill provided for an income tax on these rich millionaires who now put their money away in lock boxes in the banks and who evade their taxes by moving to Washington, escaping the taxes in the States.

These Mapes bills were passed unanimously by this House, not a vote against them. They went to the Senate and died there because of the fight the newspapers of Washington made in conjunction with the rich interests who joined the newspapers in the fight.

We have tried to get these Mapes bills passed every year, but we cannot get the District Committee to report them or any help from the Commissioners of the District.

We were greatly helped by one valuable Member from your side [Mr. DITTER], who asked Commissioner Hazen why he did not favor the Mapes bill increasing the tax on gasoline, and he said: "We don't need it. We have over \$600,000 surplus from the 2-cent tax now."

Mr. DITTER called attention to the fact that over in Virginia, just 4 miles from the Capitol, the gas tax was 5 cents a gallon. In Baltimore and over in Maryland, just 4 miles from the Nation's Capital, the gasoline tax is 4 cents a gallon plus 5 cents sales tax on top of it.

Down in Tennessee, where our beloved Speaker lives, the gasoline tax is 7 cents a gallon, while here in Washington it is only 2 cents a gallon.

Mr. DITTER asked the Commissioner if he was going to help pass the Mapes bill and he said no, that the Commissioners were against it because they did not need the money.

They do not need the money because they have been getting the benefit of millions of dollars from the Treasury of the United States in big lump-sum appropriations every year, which the Senate has forced the House to appropriate.

Now, getting the low tax rate, the Commissioners reduced the tax rate from \$1.80 to \$1.70 in 1928, and then to \$1.50 per \$100. Then the chairman of the Senate committee, who is making this fight against us, Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, made the suggestion one summer that one way to make the tax even less was to lower the assessed valuation, which the Commissioners immediately did. I will show you just what they did. I will show you from the hearings on the 1935 bill, held by my distinguished friend, Mr. CANNON, of Missouri, one of the finest Members of this House, and I will quote what Commissioner Hazen then said.

This is the voluntary statement of Commissioner Hazen to the committee without a question being asked by a member, and I read from page 5 of the hearings on the 1935 appropriation bill:

Commissioner HAZEN. Before the auditor takes the stand, the Commissioners would like to call attention to the fact that in the fiscal year 1934, the tax rate of \$1.70 on the hundred, which had been in effect during the fiscal years between 1928 and 1933, included, has been reduced to \$1.50 per hundred. This reduction represents a saving to the taxpayers in the fiscal year of 1934 of \$2,445,000.

A saving to the taxpayers of the District of Columbia, Mr. Speaker, at the expense of the taxpayers of New York, Tennessee, Oklahoma, Texas, and the other States.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Is the gentleman going to take the whole hour or will he yield time to somebody?

Mr. BLANTON. I do not think the gentleman from Massachusetts could help me much on this matter which I have studied for years.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry, but I cannot yield just now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas declines to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not want to take up any more time than necessary, but I am going to present this matter in a

proper way, so that the responsibility for continuing to take the money in the Treasury, which was taken out of the pockets of the overburdened taxpayers of the United States, and give it to Washington, will be placed where it belongs, on the shoulders of those who want it done, and who furnish the votes to do it.

When I was on the District Committee some few years ago, then the ranking Democrat, a bill was brought in to appropriate a large sum to buy some park ends. I got me an automobile and one of the officials from the District office and went out there to see where the park ends were and what they looked like, and I found they were some little old pieces of swamp down under a bridge and nearby. They were not worth \$5. We were asked to pay a big sum of money for them under the bill. The bill had been introduced by a Senator from Colorado, named Phipps. I looked up on the hill and I saw a fine residence there and said, "Whose residence is that?" The man with me did not know. I said, "Yonder is a policeman, we will call him down and find out." We called him down, and I said, "Whose residence is that?" "Why," he replied, "don't you know? That is the residence of Senator Phipps, of Colorado, and he is putting an addition up there." I came to town and got a photographer and had some big pictures taken of that situation, and when I presented those pictures on the floor, this House killed that bill as dead as could be. There has been too much of using the money of the people for individual interests here. [Applause.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry, but I do not think the gentleman could help me now. He may later, if he will help me with his vote. I have the facts I believe better than he has. Listen again. Here is Commissioner Hazen talking further, from whose testimony I quote:

Moreover, in the fiscal year 1934 the assessed valuation of real estate has been reduced by \$80,000,000—

You see, he has taken up Senator THOMAS' suggestion that they should decrease the assessed value.

Moreover, in the fiscal year 1934 the assessed valuation of real estate has been reduced by \$80,000,000, a saving to the property owners of \$1,200,000. The District budget for the fiscal year 1935 is based upon continuing the \$1.50 tax rate in that fiscal year. It is also contemplated that a further reduction in the assessed valuation of real estate of approximately \$50,000,000 will be made in 1935. The Commissioners also invite attention to the recommendation under the chapter for water service to a 25-percent reduction in water rates, for 1935, and an increase in the metered allowance of water from 7,500 cubic feet to 10,000 cubic feet. This means a saving to the water users of Washington of about \$600,000 annually. In the fiscal year 1934 Congress allowed a discount of 10 percent on the amount of any bill for water charges paid within 15 days after the date of rendition, and it is estimated this will make a saving of another \$100,000 to the water users of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to put in the RECORD the balance of the admissions made by Commissioner Hazen on these matters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to ask if the gentleman is going to yield any time to anybody, or if he will yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Gladly, if the gentleman will allow me to finish.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is asking to fill up the RECORD. We have listened for 15 minutes now to the reading of the motion, and we have now to listen to a whole hour of rehashing the matter on the floor.

Mr. BLANTON. I knew the gentleman was going to make that comment, and that is the reason I would not yield. Does he want his tax-burdened people in Massachusetts to help pay the taxes of the people in Washington?

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to say to the gentleman that we have been very loyal to him in backing him up on these propositions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to ask the gentleman if he is going to yield any time.

[Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, let him ask his question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. All right, I will take the time, then, to tell the facts about this situation. Commissioner Hazen admitted that all of the paved streets here in Washington in the years gone by had been paid for, one-half of the expense, by the taxpayers of the United States.

He admitted that all the fine bridges here, the Million Dollar Bridge on Connecticut Avenue and other fine bridges, had been paid for one-half by the people of the United States. He admitted that all of the 150 school buildings that had been built during that time, although there are 175 now, had been one-half paid for by the people of the United States. He admitted that the parks in Washington, big and little, 1,200 of them, had been all procured and paid for one-half by the people of the United States. He admitted that the original water system had been built here by the Government of the United States. The Government had paid for every dollar of it. The Government of the United States still owns the original conduit and has spent \$20,000,000 since in helping to improve it; yet now they are asking the Government to pay for its own water from its own water system. They have a water rate here where he admitted that the average charge for the average family is only \$6.60 per year, or about 50 cents per month. Some members have to pay twice that much some months for water around their residence in the States.

Commissioner Hazen admitted that the District Jail had been paid for one-half by the United States, that all the court buildings have been paid for one-half by the United States, that the Municipal Building was paid for one-half by the United States. He admitted that all the main improvements here had been paid for one-half by the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will ask my colleague if it is not a fact that the water system here was paid for altogether by the Federal Government?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. Yes; it was. The United States still owns the original water conduit. My colleague is correct. He knows the facts.

When the newspapers were harassing former Chairman Ben Johnson, of Kentucky, he made a statement concerning this Government taking the District out of debt one time, and he told of other amounts that the Government had let the District have. Ben Johnson contended back in that early day that if the District of Columbia paid the Government what it owed it, it would pay the United States over \$56,000,000 for actual debts, advancements that the Government had made to it. Ben Johnson then was one of the hardest working men who ever served on the District of Columbia Committee.

Mr. Speaker, Commissioner Hazen admitted that the gasoline tax here is only 2 cents a gallon. It is 7 cents in Tennessee. He admitted that the automobile license tag, whether it was for a Ford or a \$12,000 Rolls-Royce, was only \$1 a year. Down in Oklahoma it costs you 10 or 15 times that much. In other States it is comparably higher. He admitted, Mr. Speaker, that the intangible tax was only one-half of one percent; that generally, until a man dies and his estate is probated through the court under the register of wills, his intangibles are not found. We showed a half-page list of people who had died the previous year and had passed their intangibles through the office of the Register of Wills, and there were some running up from \$50,000 to as high as \$1,200,000 of intangibles in one case. We made him admit, Mr. Speaker, that in Washington, all of the streets are repaired and are replaced without charge to abutting property owners. The paving in front of your property is repaired

and replaced without a dollar's charge to the contiguous property owner.

In other States when paving is done on streets you pay one-third or one-fourth of the paving charges in front of your property. In Washington when it is repaved it does not cost the people a cent. We made him admit that all the sidewalks in front of residences here are replaced and repaved without one dollar of cost to the people who own the contiguous property. We made him admit that to every family in Washington there is \$1,000 household furniture exemption from taxes. You will not find it in my State. It is only \$250 exemption in Texas on household goods. In Washington it is \$1,000 exemption. We made him admit that here in Washington private libraries are exempt from taxes, whether they are worth \$5 or \$50,000. There are some private law and other libraries in Washington right now worth \$50,000 which do not pay one cent of taxes. We made him admit that in Washington the wearing apparel of individuals is not taxed at all. By the law it has been made exempt from taxes, whether it is worth \$5 or \$50,000. We had some evidence, and I have it in my office now, where the wearing apparel of certain rich families will run up to a very large sum in value, absolutely exempt from taxes.

That is why our committee, when we printed the hearings, put into our hearings the actual tax that is paid by over 100 of the leading citizens of Washington who were drawing from \$20,000 to \$75,000 annual salaries, and showed that their property was assessed in instances at less than one-half its actual value. Then they were paying only \$1.50 per hundred at that low assessment. For instance, we showed you that Mr. Eugene Meyer once had offered \$5,000,000 for the Washington Post. We showed you that his offer was not accepted. Later on David Lawrence entered into a written contract to pay \$3,000,000 for it, the Washington Post, and he was knocked out of it. Then Eugene Meyer got hold of a paper company that had a debt against the Post and had a receiver to sell, appointed in an equity proceeding, when there was no judgment, something unheard of in equity proceedings in the whole jurisprudence of the country.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the matter which the gentleman is presenting to the House at the present time has nothing whatever to do with the motion before the House. The question of how Mr. Eugene Meyer bought or came into possession of the Washington Post has nothing to do with the question of instructing the House conferees.

The SPEAKER. The Chair trusts that the gentleman from Texas will proceed in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thought I was proceeding in order in trying to show the House a basis for instructions. We are not asking the House of Representatives to instruct us to stand by something without some basis for it. I am asking the House to instruct us on the facts that exist here. I am trying to show what the facts are as admitted by Commissioner Hazen.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I always yield gladly to the minority leader.

Mr. SNELL. How does the question of the amount of money Eugene Meyer paid for the Post, whether he got it too cheap or paid too much for it, have anything to do with the question before the House at the present time?

Mr. BLANTON. I was coming to that. If I did not show what it was rendered at for taxes it would not.

Mr. SNELL. In my judgment it would not. I should like to have the gentleman tell us how it affects the motion.

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to show the gentleman that he renders it for taxes at way below 50 percent of its real value. In other words, Mr. Speaker, he got that \$3,000,000 to \$5,000,000 property at auction when it was under receivership, for \$825,000, got it through a dummy. He immediately had it incorporated for \$1,250,000. Then he had it improved, and he now renders the property for \$438,120, and renders his intangibles at \$218,456. He renders the whole

property at only \$656,576, about one-eighth of what it is worth, and on this he pays only \$1.50 per \$100. That is what it means to these big interests here to keep the tax rate low and make the people of the United States in the several States pay \$5,700,000 of their expenses.

Mr. MAY and Mr. TABER rose.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield first to my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who has studied this question for years, if he desires any time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman wants to yield I would suggest that he yield to some of those Members who care to say something against the resolution. I would be willing to take a little time later, but at the present time, I think those who are opposed should be heard.

Mr. BLANTON. If somebody here is opposed to the motion I am going to yield to him.

Mr. TABER. If there is going to be opposition, I think those opposed should be heard.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman in favor of having the people of this country pay \$5,700,000 annually toward the local taxes of Washington people?

Mr. GIFFORD. That is not a fair question. I am opposed to the form of the motion, and I want to ask a question about what form the conference report will take.

Mr. BLANTON. There are just three matters on which the House insists.

Mr. GIFFORD. I understand that.

Mr. BLANTON. Whether the conferees are to be instructed to stand by the House bill on the \$5,700,000 lump sum, on the \$78,660 so-called character education, and on the restriction on certain officials and employees of the District taking outside employment.

Mr. GIFFORD. I understand that; the gentleman has been talking for years about the Washington situation and I have always backed him up, but I want to ask the gentleman a question, if I may.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. GIFFORD. Did I understand the gentleman to say the House conferees agreed to recede on 84 points if the Senate would recede on 3?

Mr. BLANTON. In the final hopes of getting a bill; yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. That appeals to us as a sort of horse trading on matters that ought to be settled on their merits; and we feel, I am sure the gentleman will realize, that by reason of certain reports in the newspapers, that perhaps the gentleman may be a little stubborn by this time and that he would rather make a horse trade than to settle the matters on their merits.

Mr. BLANTON. That is so far from the fact that it is absolutely absurd.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman cannot blame us for having a little feeling that the gentleman might feel a little hurt because of this newspaper criticism.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the newspapers do not bother me at all. They are wasting \$5,000 to have a man try to beat me in Texas, but my dependable constituents are not going to let them beat me.

Mr. GIFFORD. Another question: Does the gentleman feel it is a fair way to settle things to make a horse trade giving way on 84 points?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is trying to shoot a stiletto under my belt when he should be trying to help me. I thought the gentleman from Massachusetts was one of the best horse traders we had.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; in just a minute. Let me finish this statement and then I will. I will save 5 minutes for the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, continuing the benefits the people of Washington receive, Mr. Hazen admitted in this document, in every hearing for 3 years, that the people of Washington, except the Federal tax everybody pays, do not pay any

estate tax, do not pay any inheritance tax, do not pay any gift tax, do not pay any income tax, do not pay any sales tax as they do over here in Maryland just a few miles away and as they do in many of the Western States; not a dollar of those extra taxes do they pay. They are not bonded, because the United States paid them out of debt and kept them out of debt. They do not pay any jail-bond tax, they do not pay any courthouse-bond tax, they do not pay any bridge tax, they do not pay any special water tax, they do not pay any special school tax. The have their ashes gathered free, they have all their trash gathered free, they have their garbage gathered free. The trees in front of their residences, shade and ornamental, are furnished without charge.

They are planted without charge. They have fences built around them to protect their early growth without charge. They are cared for without charge. They are pruned without charge. They are sprayed without charge. They are replaced without charge.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the benefits that the people of Washington receive because the Congress has been voting these large contributions each year from the people of the rest of the United States. If the House wants to keep on doing that, I am their servant and would be compelled to obey the orders of the House, but I hope the House will not order it done.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I want to get this perfectly clear, for the benefit of myself and some others who may not understand the situation. Under the existing system I understand the gentleman to say that in the city of Washington if property is of a fair and reasonable value of a million dollars and the tax rate is \$1.50, the assessed value of the property is reduced to \$500,000, which would make a tax rate equal to 75 cents on the hundred?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; they have been doing that all the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to one more thing, where the Senate tried to make us come over to their way of thinking. They got an absurd statement from a fellow named Parker that Washington was the third highest taxed city in the United States.

The President sent us a report last year which gave the tax rate in 15 comparable cities of the United States. In that report it was stated that Washington was the lowest taxed city of any which had been investigated. This man Parker gave a statement to the Senate which was ridiculous on its face, in which he stated that Washington was the third highest taxed city in the country.

In our conference with the Senate they wanted us to hear of Parker and Richards. We said, "All right. Get a stenographer and we will hear them in joint session." They said, "No; we do not want a stenographer." We said, "Well, we will not hear them without a stenographer. We want to know what they have said when their testimony gets cold." The Senate conferees would not agree to that, so we told them they could hold the hearing by themselves. After we left they immediately got a stenographer to take down what was said, but they did not prove by these gentlemen what we proved by them.

We sent for Parker and found out that this man Parker was drawing \$9,600 a year from a joint committee of Congress, yet last October sold himself to the board of trade here in Washington, and they paid him \$5,500 in cash for his statement.

Now, there is one thing funny about Richards.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Was a quorum present?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, referring to Mr. Richards, may I say that he had reached the age for retirement. He had been paying into the retirement fund for 27 years and could have retired with a big retired pay for life, but he could not do that and at the same time accept employment from the board of trade; so in order to be able to accept employment from the board of trade when he left office, instead of retiring on a salary for life he resigned and had the Civil Service Commission pay him back all that he had paid into the retirement fund. He then got on the board of trade's pay roll and became the exemplar of the high-taxed District. The Senate did not discover that.

It will be noted all through the hearings Chairman CANNON made him admit that every time we wanted to take a piece of property here we had to pay sometimes 10 times its assessed value before we could get it. When the new House Office Building and the Supreme Court Building were constructed, just note what we had to pay for the property under the testimony of the tax experts of Washington. We had to pay, in instances, as high as 10 times what the property had been assessed at.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas brings this matter before the Members of the House in a very unusual way. I am happy to say that at times the gentleman from Texas makes constructive and lucid suggestions with reference to legislation for the District of Columbia, and I am always glad to follow him when he does make intelligent and constructive suggestions. However, he brings before us today a conference report under a method which has never been followed by the Congress—since I have been here at least. The Speaker, I think, will permit a division of the question when a vote is reached, but the Members cannot vote "yes" or "no" on any one of the propositions without approving, sanctioning, and saying "yes" to the conclusions and the stump speech which the gentleman has woven into every provision of the resolution.

Under the custom which has grown up in the Congress, if it is desired to explain the reasons for proposed legislation, a preamble is used, with the word "whereas." Then when a vote is reached on the legislation the vote is upon the substantive matter only, and the "whereas" and the explanatory matter is eliminated. In the pending resolution it is impossible to cut out the "whereases" and the gentleman's arguments and conclusions. While I might agree in many particulars with some of the gentleman's proposed instructions to conferees, I am not going to vote to approve of the quarrel which the gentleman from Texas has with the Washington newspapers or with the Washington people in any particular, because he has interwoven these stump speeches in a piece of constructive legislation.

Mr. Speaker, a point of order will be made that the resolution as presented is not in accordance with the rules of the House. I hope that the Speaker will hold that a Member cannot intelligently vote for a given specific thing by voting for this resolution.

If this is done, then the gentleman from Texas, who is a good parliamentarian and knows better, can retire, and inside of 10 minutes dictate just what he wants us to vote on. The astute, the discerning majority leader, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], rose on the floor and asked the gentleman from Texas what this resolution meant. He asked the gentleman if he would try to explain it so that he, our majority leader, might know what he was asked to vote upon.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Not now.

The real trouble is that the gentleman from Texas takes page after page of the RECORD, day after day and hour after hour of the time of the Congress fighting windmills and fighting the Washington newspapers and Eugene Meyer. Why, great Caesar, we have heard this time after time and day after day. His personal quarrel has nothing to do with what is before us. I think the time has arrived when the Speaker—and I hope he will do so—should exercise that fair

judgment that he always exercises and give those of us who want to vote for constructive things an opportunity to know what we are voting for, because if he does not, we are compelled to vote against this proposition, or we must put our stamp of approval upon the gentleman's modus operandi here, upon his tactics, and upon his conclusions so far as his various difficulties with the various agencies in the District of Columbia are concerned. The purpose of this proceeding is to instruct our conferees as to the position of the House on certain differences between the House and the Senate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, to meet the gentleman's objection, I have had a motion drawn eliminating all the facts and conclusions and including simply the instructions, and I think this will meet the objection of the gentleman from Michigan, and I ask unanimous consent to present this in lieu of the other motion.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that is just the point I am making. This shows clearly that the gentleman from Texas knows better, but he attempts to put in the RECORD a stump speech which should not be here, and when somebody has the courage and the bravery to stand up and question the tactics of the gentleman, then he graciously concedes that he is wrong. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not concede I am wrong at all. Every fact stated in my motion, as a basis for the House thus to instruct its conferees, was admitted in the printed hearings by Commissioner Hazen in his testimony, and Commissioner Hazen further said that "the people of Washington had greater privileges and were the least taxed and the best cared for of any people in the United States"; but to meet the gentleman's objection I ask that the following motion, without the time to read it being taken out of my time, be substituted for the other motion.

Mr. Sisson and Mr. MAVERICK objected.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the first motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas, under the rules of the House, has the authority to withdraw his first motion.

Mr. BLANTON. And I offer another motion of the highest privilege in the place of the one that has been read.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a motion which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, does this mean that a person can put in a motion which is obviously a long stump speech and then can withdraw it at will? I want to know so I can do that in the future, also. Is that proper procedure?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not passing upon what is proper procedure. The Chair is simply stating what the rules and precedents of the House permit a Member to do.

Mr. MAVERICK. I want to know, so that I can do the same thing.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether or not if such procedure is followed, the gentleman from Texas will be entitled to an additional hour, because this is a different resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think so.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not want an additional hour, but merely the remaining time still due me.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield for a parliamentary inquiry, unless the gentleman from New York wants to make it on this one matter.

Mr. SNELL. It is on the matter before the House.

Mr. BLANTON. With the understanding it will not be taken out of my remaining time, I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to have a ruling on this proposition. I made the point of order earlier that the argumentative part of the original propo-

sition was not in order and I think for the future precedents of the House we should have a ruling on that question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman made his point of order before the reading of the motion had been concluded, as the gentleman will recall.

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

The SPEAKER. And the Chair stated at the time that the Chair felt the motion should be read in full, which was then done. So far as the main question is concerned, of course, the point of order made by the gentleman from Michigan comes entirely too late, because debate has been practically concluded.

The gentleman from New York did not renew his point of order at the conclusion of the reading of the resolution.

The rule to which the Chair has referred provides only for a motion, but the Chair does not believe that any presiding officer ought to put himself in the position of dictating to a Member just how his motion should be made. If the Chair should hold that the motion carries argument, then it would be up to the Chair to delete from the motion such portions as occurred to the Chair to be argumentative, and if that were the practice the Chair at some time might delete portions of the motion in exercising that privilege.

The Chair thinks this is a matter for the House to decide, and the Chair is unwilling, out of a spirit of fairness, to undertake to dictate to the Members just how they shall draw their motions. [Applause.]

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

MOTION OF HIGHEST PRIVILEGE

Mr. BLANTON, under clause 1½a of rule XXVIII, section 910, of the rules of the House of Representatives, offers the following motion to instruct House conferees, being a motion of the highest privilege, to wit:

Moved that managers on the part of the House, who, at the request of the Senate, were appointed by the Speaker on April 24, 1936, for a conference with the managers on the part of the Senate, who were appointed by the Senate on April 23, 1936, respecting the disagreeing votes of the two Houses relative to 87 amendments placed by the Senate on the House bill (H. R. 11581) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, have been in conference more than 20 days without avall, said House conferees having been appointed for more than 20 calendar days, and have made no report to the House, that they, the said managers on the part of the House be, and they are hereby, instructed as follows:

First. The House instructs its managers to insist on the disagreement of the House to Senate amendment no. 1, which proposes to appropriate \$5,700,000 out of the United States Treasury as a Federal contribution on the local civic expenses of the District of Columbia, and to insist on the House provision respecting same.

Second. The House instructs its managers to insist on the disagreement of the House to Senate amendments nos. 37, 38, and 39, appropriating \$78,660 for so-called character education, and to insist on the refusal of the House to appropriate any money for so-called character education.

Third. The House instructs its managers to insist on the disagreement of the House to Senate amendment no. 83, which struck from the House bill "Sec. 6", which Senate amendment 83 would permit high-salaried judges, high-salaried prosecuting attorneys, high-salaried doctors, and other high-salaried officers and employees to accept outside employment from others.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will pass upon that later.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, my time has not expired and I want to say in conclusion—

Mr. SNELL. Are we going to debate this all over again?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has 12 minutes remaining under the rule.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman has presented a different resolution to the House and the Speaker has ruled he is not entitled to time on the second resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has 12 minutes remaining out of the hour allowed him under the rule.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have done my honest, conscientious duty in presenting this motion to the House. As chairman of the House conferees, I am the servant of the House. It is immaterial to me personally what the House does about it. I am ready to obey the instructions of

the House on these matters, and under your instructions to carry them out. If you tell the House conferees what you want done, I will stand against the Senate until something terribly hot freezes over, before I give in to them. But it all depends on what the House wants done, and how you instruct your conferees.

If you gentlemen who have been throwing obstacles in my way want the people of Washington to keep up this peculiar situation, unjust to the people of the States, where they pay very little local civic taxes in Washington, D. C., and our people back home in the States have to contribute \$5,700,000 in cash every year out of the United States Treasury to pay part of the taxes due by Washington citizens, and you can persuade this House by a majority vote to instruct the House conferees to agree to appropriate the \$5,700,000, we conferees will be forced to carry out your instructions. But I do not believe you will ever get this House to thus instruct us.

The Washington Star said, on April 26, 1936, that the Washington Board of Trade records show that during the last 5 years visitors to Washington had spent \$221,547,992 here in cash. Visitors from the States contributed that amount to the people of Washington during the last 5 years. You know what that means to Washington—\$221,547,992 spent here in 5 years by visitors from our States.

They visited Washington because it is the Nation's Capital. They visited Washington because of the Government buildings here. They visited Washington because of the attractive institutions the Government has constructed here.

Now, if a majority of you gentlemen want to continue this, it is all right—giving away of the people's money out of the United States Treasury to the pampered people of Washington—we conferees will have to obey your instructions, but I will never vote for it, and I am now throwing the responsibility upon your shoulders.

I have done all that any one man could do to stop this injustice. The splendid members of my subcommittee have done all they could do, and they have done wonderful work to protect the already overburdened taxpayers living in the 48 States of this Nation.

There is no one who, truthfully, can say that I have not been fair and just to the people of Washington. There is no one who will say that I have not worked hard and have not spent much of my time to adjust these inequities.

I am one Member of Congress who in 20 years has represented three big districts—71 big counties in Texas—some of which like Presidio and Brewster are 200 miles across the county. I represent only 12 counties now. But some of these good people living in my two former districts still call on me for different things they want done, as I am their friend.

I have to do this in addition to my official duties for my own district, and I work about 16 hours per day in order to attend to all such calls.

If some of my friends, very liberal-thinking friends, do not like what I did toward eliminating communism from the public schools when we passed the "red rider", and they want to take a stand against me, on these propositions, then well and good. It is their responsibility. It is not mine. I will meet them on that issue of repealing the "red rider" whenever they get it up before the House.

Mr. Speaker, these are three clear-cut issues for the House to decide. It must decide first whether it will let the Senate force it to make the people of the States contribute \$5,700,000 each year to pay local civic expenses of Washington people. Then the House must decide whether it is going to waste another \$78,660 on so-called character education for Superintendent Ballou to pervert in communizing the public schools of Washington. And, last, the House must decide whether it is going to allow high-salaried judges, and high-salaried prosecuting attorneys, and high-salaried doctors to neglect their duties by accepting outside employment in local colleges. Those are the three issues.

I have performed my duty. The able members of my subcommittee have performed their duty. The responsibility now rests upon the shoulders of the House. We man-

agers on the part of the House, who are servants of the House, stand ready to obey the orders of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my colleagues for granting me permission to quote the testimony of Commissioner Hazen and of Mr. Parker from our hearings.

From our printed hearings on the 1935 bill I quote the following:

Commissioner HAZEN. The Commissioners would like to call attention to the fact that in the fiscal year 1934 the tax rate of \$1.70, which has been in effect during the fiscal years between 1928 and 1933, inclusive, has been reduced to \$1.50. This reduction represents a saving to taxpayers in the fiscal year 1934 of \$2,445,000.

Moreover, in the fiscal year 1934 the assessed valuation of real estate has been reduced by \$80,000,000—a saving to property owners of \$1,200,000. The District budget for the fiscal year 1935 is based upon continuing the \$1.50 tax rate in that fiscal year.

It is also contemplated that a further reduction in the assessed valuation of real estate of approximately \$50,000,000 will be made in 1935.

The Commissioners also invite attention to the recommendation under the chapter for the water service for a 25-percent reduction in water rates for 1935, and an increase in the metered allowance now 7,500 cubic feet to 10,000 cubic feet. This means a saving to water users of about \$600,000. In the fiscal year 1934 Congress allowed a discount of 10 percent of the amount of any bill for water charges paid within 15 days after the date of the rendition thereof. It is estimated that this will mean a saving of about \$100,000 to water users.

From our printed hearings of the 1936 bill, I quote the following:

Mr. BLANTON. By a reduction in the assessed valuations of real estate to the extent of \$80,000,000, you meant that you distributed that over the general assessments?

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Then you further state:

"It is also contemplated that a further reduction in the assessed value of real estate of approximately \$50,000,000 will be made in 1935."

Did you make that further reduction?

Commissioner HAZEN. There was further reduction.

Mr. BLANTON. And you did make another reduction, approximately \$50,000,000, in assessed values, as noted by the assessor, Mr. Richards, of 10 percent in the assessed valuations?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And that was general all over the District?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. So that property owners generally got the benefit of that additional \$50,000,000 reduction?

Commissioner HAZEN. That is quite right.

Mr. BLANTON. Then this year and last year you have given the property owners in the District a reduction in the assessed values of real estate of \$130,000,000, or 15 percent, have you not?

Commissioner HAZEN. Approximately; yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Then you also say:

"The Commissioners also invite attention to the recommendation under the chapter for the water service for a 25-percent reduction in water rates for 1935 and an increase in the metered allowance, now 7,500 cubic feet, to 10,000 cubic feet. This means a saving to water users of about \$600,000."

That was provided?

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. So that the property owners of the District got a saving of \$600,000 through a decrease in water charges?

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. In addition to that \$600,000 decrease in water charges, they also got the benefit of the increased metered allowance of 2,500 cubic feet of water?

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Without extra charge?

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. So that they got a double benefit in the matter of the water charges?

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Then you further say:

"In the fiscal year 1934 Congress allowed a discount of 10 percent of the amount of any bill for water charges paid within 15 days after the date of the rendition thereof. It is estimated that this will mean a saving of about \$100,000 to water users."

That was a saving of \$100,000 additional, approximately?

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. To water users here in Washington?

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. It is a fact, Mr. Commissioner, that the tax rate this year, the fiscal year 1935, is only \$1.50 per 100 on real estate and only \$1.50 per 100 on personal property, is it not?

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. There is no contemplation in the minds of the Commissioners to increase that tax for next year, 1936? You do not contemplate increasing it?

Commissioner HAZEN. We do not contemplate increasing it.

Mr. BLANTON. With that \$1.50 tax rate, you stated in your preliminary general statement, that you carried over from the last fiscal year to the present fiscal year a surplus of \$4,600,000?

Commissioner HAZEN. That is right.

Mr. BLANTON. And you say that you will inherit next July 1 a surplus of—

Commissioner HAZEN. \$2,450,000.

Mr. BLANTON. You have also, for this coming fiscal year, a trust fund, as you said in your general statement, of \$1,430,000?

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. That is a fund to which you have access, which you get out of the Treasury, regardless of what Congress does in this bill, is it not?

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. You have no income tax for the District of Columbia?

Commissioner HAZEN. That is true.

Mr. BLANTON. * * * The tax on intangibles in the District is now what, Mr. Donovan?

Mr. DONOVAN. \$5 per thousand.

Mr. BLANTON. That is one-half of 1 percent, is it not?

Mr. DONOVAN. That is right.

Mr. BLANTON. In the District of Columbia there is a gasoline tax of 2 cents a gallon?

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. In the District of Columbia there is a license-tag tax that people pay in order to get their license plates each year. That amounts to only \$1 per car.

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. That would be \$1 per car for an \$8,000 Rolls-Royce limousine as well as a dollar per car for a Ford or a Chevrolet?

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. In the District of Columbia the average water tax per family is now approximately what?

Mr. DONOVAN. It is about \$8.75.

Mr. BLANTON. Was not that the tax before Congress reduced it?

Mr. DONOVAN. It was that before Congress reduced it.

Mr. BLANTON. But Congress reduced it?

Mr. DONOVAN. You mean the 25-percent reduction?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In the District of Columbia a man who built a house 25 years ago, and then paid for having his house connected with the sewer system of the District, has not in the last 25 years had to pay a single additional monthly service charge for sewers, has he?

Commissioner HAZEN. No.

Mr. BLANTON. And he will not have to pay any in the future, will he?

Commissioner HAZEN. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Commissioner, you have been a public servant for a long time, and you are intimately acquainted with every detail of Washington business and history. On the whole, can you cite the people of any city of the United States who have better privileges, who are better cared for, than those in the city of Washington?

Commissioner HAZEN. I think that it is the greatest city in the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. And Washington people are better cared for, are least taxed, and have greater privileges than any other people in the United States?

Commissioner HAZEN. I believe they do.

From our printed hearings on the 1937 bill, I quote the following:

Mr. BLANTON. You are acquainted with the four Mapes bills?

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir; somewhat.

Mr. BLANTON. One of those bills has for its purpose to increase the gasoline tax from 2 to 4 cents, to make it comparable with the gasoline tax in other cities.

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Has that bill the approval of the Commissioners?

Commissioner HAZEN. The answer is that we have a surplus, and we did not feel we could justifiably increase taxes as long as we had a surplus.

Mr. BLANTON. And it is because you have a large surplus—\$3,059,748.70—that you are against that increase-of-gasoline-tax bill?

Commissioner HAZEN. We have to consider the surplus.

Mr. BLANTON. What surplus do you expect to have in the general fund on July 1?

Commissioner HAZEN. \$1,992,748.70.

Mr. DONOVAN. That is only in the general fund.

Mr. BLANTON. That is in the general fund. Now, what about the water fund?

Commissioner HAZEN. In the water fund we will have \$504,000.

Mr. BLANTON. And in your gasoline-tax fund?

Commissioner HAZEN. \$563,000.

Mr. BLANTON. So that aggregates a surplus of \$3,059,748.70 on July 1.

GASOLINE TAX IN VARIOUS STATES

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Commissioner, I call attention to the gasoline tax that is now effective in the cities of various States:

Alabama, 6 cents; Arizona, 5 cents; Arkansas, 6 cents; Colorado, 4 cents; Florida, 7 cents; Georgia, 6 cents; Idaho, 5 cents; Indiana, 4 cents; Kentucky, 5 cents; Louisiana, 5 cents; Maine, 4 cents; Maryland, 4 cents; Nebraska, 4 cents; Nevada, 4 cents; New Hampshire, 4 cents; New Mexico, 5 cents; North Carolina, 6 cents; Ohio, 4 cents; Oklahoma, 4 cents; Oregon, 4 cents; Pennsylvania, 3 cents; South Carolina, 6 cents; Tennessee, 7 cents; Texas, 4 cents; Utah, 4 cents; Vermont, 4 cents; Virginia, 5 cents; Washington (State), 5 cents; West Virginia, 4 cents; Wisconsin, 4 cents; and Wyoming, 4 cents.

But in the District of Columbia the tax is 2 cents per gallon. So that right over here across the river bridge, when you get into Virginia, the State gasoline tax is 3 cents more than it is in Washington, D. C.

Commissioner HAZEN. I think it is 5 cents in Virginia and 4 cents in Maryland.

Mr. BLANTON. But Maryland has an additional sales tax. I say it is 3 cents more in Virginia, just across the bridge, than it is in Washington.

Commissioner HAZEN. In Virginia?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; than it is in Washington?

Commissioner HAZEN. That is right.

Mr. BLANTON. And if you go out here to Chevy Chase across the line into Maryland, the tax there is double what it is in Washington, 4 cents as compared to 2 cents, plus their sales tax.

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And the cities in all of the States outside of Washington, D. C., instead of paying a license-tag tax of a dollar pay many times that; you realize that?

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In other words, in some States they pay \$10 and \$12 on a Ford or Chevrolet, while in Washington you pay only a dollar even on a \$10,000 Rolls-Royce.

The Mapes bill proposes to increase that charge, does it not?

Mr. DONOVAN. The Mapes bill calls for a weight tax.

Commissioner HAZEN. Another very good idea that we have down there is that we make them pay the police fines and penalties.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; that is a good idea. But you do recognize that if you needed it, you have a great potential source of revenue in an increase of your gasoline tax comparable to that in other cities, and also in the increase of your license-tag tax; do you not?

Commissioner HAZEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. But you do not care to pursue that, because you have a \$3,000,000 surplus.

MAPES BILLS NOT FAVORED BY COMMISSIONERS AT PRESENT TIME

Mr. BLANTON. Those four Mapes bills all passed the House several years ago by a unanimous vote—all four of them. Mr. MAPES is an exceptionally fine Member of Congress; able, sincere, and honest. His committee went into this subject carefully and prepared those bills after having months of hearings and giving close consideration of the subject. The four bills passed the House without a vote against them.

They have been held up by the Senate.

Would you mind telling us whether or not you favor the other Mapes bills?

Commissioner HAZEN. We do not at the present time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLANTON. One of those bills I would like to know your reaction on, as to why you are not willing to require these big trucks, engaged in interstate freight traffic, that use up and wear out the streets and highways of the city of Washington, to pay a much larger charge as provided for in the Mapes bill.

Mr. HAZEN. I think it would be a very fair thing to do.

Mr. BLANTON. Have your Commissioners suggested the passage of such legislation as that?

Mr. HAZEN. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you realize that until you do have legislation passed like that, that these big trucks, some larger than a railroad freight car, that crowd people off of the street, are continually using your hundreds of miles of highways in the District of Columbia, practically with no charge at all on them?

Mr. HAZEN. That is right, except for the gasoline that they use, of course.

Mr. DITTER. Insofar as the license privilege is concerned, the operator of a truck or bus, irrespective of its weight and its potential damage to your streets, pays just the same as a pleasure car? Is that correct?

Mr. HAZEN. Do you mean public-utility busses?

Mr. DITTER. I am talking of any busses or trucks to which licenses are issued in the District of Columbia, that they pay the same amount as a Chevrolet or Ford coupe, the weight of which would not be comparable nor the potential damage to your streets be as great.

Mr. HAZEN. They pay the same, except the utility busses.

Mr. DITTER. And the utility bus has to take out a certificate of public convenience, that is issued to it as a public utility, but,

insofar as an automobile license operation privilege is concerned, they pay exactly the same?

Mr. RICHARDS. They pay the same, plus the tax on personal property; that is all.

Mr. BLANTON. They all pay that.

Mr. DITTER. They all pay the same. Do not let us quibble about it. They pay exactly the same as the Chevrolet or Ford pleasure car on the road.

Mr. HAZEN. I have no brief for the busses.

Mr. DITTER. We are not condemning them either, but we want to know something now.

Why is it that the Commissioners have refused to recommend the enactment of legislation by which trucks or busses would be required to pay a licensed operation cost comparable to those charged by other municipalities and States?

Mr. HAZEN. I rather think that we should have the whole thing, passenger cars as well as busses, covered by the same legislation.

Mr. DITTER. Have you made any recommendation with respect to the enactment of such legislation?

Mr. HAZEN. No; not to this Congress.

Mr. DITTER. Do the Commissioners contemplate a further consideration of the matter that was raised by Mr. BLANTON last year on the subject of taxation?

Mr. HAZEN. Mr. DITTER, the Commissioners felt that, as long as they had this surplus—

Mr. DITTER (interposing). Will you not first answer that "yes" or "no"?

Mr. HAZEN. I would rather consult the Commissioners a little bit on that problem.

Mr. DITTER. Did I understand that you were adverse to the first Mapes bill, to which the chairman directed your attention?

Mr. HAZEN. The gas bill?

Mr. DITTER. Yes.

Mr. HAZEN. I am at the present time.

Mr. DITTER. Do you speak for the Commissioners' Board as a whole, or individually?

Mr. HAZEN. I think I speak for the Commissioners.

Mr. DITTER. And your objection to it is based entirely on the fact that you have a surplus of approximately \$3,000,000?

Mr. HAZEN. Oh, no; \$500,000.

Mr. DITTER. \$3,000,000 as a whole, including \$500,000 in the gas fund—is that right?

Mr. HAZEN. That is right.

Mr. DITTER. Then, in contemplation of the elimination of that relief or emergency fund, are you not prepared to say that the Mapes bill has merit and that it should be recommended for enactment?

Mr. HAZEN. Undoubtedly it has merit, and as soon as we need the money for these things I would be very strongly in favor of it—have been all along.

Mr. DITTER. That is helpful, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLANTON. But it is easier to get it out of the Federal Treasury than through taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I now quote from the printed hearings:

STATEMENT OF LOVELL H. PARKER

Mr. BLANTON. Gentlemen, we have before us this morning Mr. L. H. Parker.

Mr. PARKER, when were you employed by the board of trade as their statistician?

Mr. PARKER. As I recall it, it was about September—it was October before we made our final arrangement.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you mean October 1935?

Mr. PARKER. 1935; yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Your report was addressed to Mr. Edward F. Colladay?

Mr. PARKER. That is right.

Mr. BLANTON. As "chairman, advisory committee, municipal finance committee, board of trade, Washington, D. C."?

Mr. PARKER. That is right.

Mr. BLANTON. You were working for them when you made this report?

Mr. PARKER. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. And as their employee you rendered them this report?

Mr. PARKER. That is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. What are they to pay you for this tax survey?

Mr. PARKER. That is \$5,500.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the board of trade pays you \$5,500?

Mr. PARKER. Yes. That is the final amount agreed on.

Mr. BLANTON. When did you get that position with the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation?

Mr. PARKER. I was appointed to that position in 1926.

Mr. BLANTON. What was your salary when you were first appointed to that position?

Mr. PARKER. \$600 a month.

Mr. BLANTON. And you have held that position continuously since 1926?

Mr. PARKER. That is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. What annual salary do you get now?

Mr. PARKER. \$800 per month.

Mr. BLANTON. When was your salary increased to \$800 per month?

Mr. PARKER. It was increased once in 1929, as I recall it, to \$700, and then it was increased in 1935 to \$800.

Mr. BLANTON. Which is approximately the equal of the salary of a Congressman or a Senator.

Mr. PARKER. Pretty nearly.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, we get \$833, and spend half of it for incidental expenses, and you get \$800; is that right?

Mr. PARKER. That is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. The committee may call on you at any time it wants to, from January to December?

Mr. PARKER. That is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. And you are at all times under orders of the committee?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you have authority from Mr. ROBERT DOUGHTON, who is the vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to accept employment from the board of trade and to receive \$5,500 for it?

Mr. PARKER. No, Mr. BLANTON, because Mr. HARRISON was chairman.

Mr. BLANTON. Please just answer my questions, Mr. Parker.

Mr. PARKER. I understood you to say that—

Mr. BLANTON. Yes or no; did you have authority from Mr. DOUGHTON to accept that employment?

Mr. PARKER. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you ever tell BOB DOUGHTON that you were going to take that employment, before you took it?

Mr. PARKER. No, Mr. BLANTON.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that there are hundreds of pieces of property here in Washington that are occupied by people which, in 1934, before there was any arbitrary reduction in assessed values made, were rendered for or had an assessed valuation much less than one-half of what they cost and what they were worth? Did you know that?

Mr. PARKER. I knew that a great many were below what they cost, but as to what they were worth, I did not think there were any as low as that; no, Mr. BLANTON.

Mr. BLANTON. For instance, here is a list of the lots covered by the New House Office Building, on which the New House Office Building was erected. Here are the figures on assessments and values given us by Tax Assessor Richards on those lots that we had to buy over there.

Here is part of lot 15, known as lot 809 in square 636; all of these are in square 636. That was assessed at \$1,479, and local Washington citizens testified that it was worth \$2,795.10, and we paid that.

Here is lot 806, assessed at \$2,345, and parties here testified that it was worth \$4,422.90. And that is what we had to pay for it.

Mr. PARKER. This was in connection with condemnation proceedings?

Mr. BLANTON. It was either condemnation or agreement, but was what the Government had to pay for it. We had to pay these amounts.

Here is lot no. 20, which was assessed at \$1,256, and Washington experts testified that it was worth \$10,100. That was nearly nine times what it was assessed at. We had to pay that for it.

Here are lots 1, 2, and 19, which were assessed at \$13,792. Parties here testified that it was worth \$34,537.50, and that is what the Government had to pay for it.

Here are lots 3, 6, 16, 17, and 18, which were assessed at \$24,193, and Washington experts testified that it was worth \$51,303.47. And that is what the Government paid for it.

Here are lots 9, 10, and 11, which were assessed at \$12,249, and Washington experts testified they were worth \$24,577.30. That is what the Government had to pay for it.

Here is lot 15, known as lot 808, assessed at \$1,759, and Washington experts testified that it was worth \$3,488.60. That is what the Government had to pay for it.

Here is lot 14, known as lot 807. That was assessed at \$2,534. Washington experts testified it was worth \$5,076.20. That is what we had to pay for it.

Here is lot 5, known as lot 800, assessed at \$2,845. Washington experts testified that it was worth \$5,692.60. That is what the Government had to pay for it.

Here is lot 5, known as lot 801, which was assessed at \$1,026. Washington experts testified that it was worth \$2,250. That is what the Government paid for it.

That gives you an idea of the low assessments here.

Mr. PARKER. May I ask, Mr. BLANTON, if those were the tax experts for the people selling the property?

Mr. BLANTON. They were experts, Mr. Parker, for the people of Washington, just as you are the expert for the board of trade, representing them, and getting \$5,500 to speak for them.

Mr. PARKER. I am wondering if the Government hired experts to give their testimony on these same properties?

Mr. BLANTON. I don't value the opinion of such hired experts. I just give these figures to show how little value their testimony is worth when they come in here and say that they are overassessed. We members of this subcommittee know they are not and we have been studying this question here for many years.

Mr. PARKER. My report does not touch on that, if I may state that. My report merely deals with figures and facts on taxation. I have not said anything about real property taxes at all.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that since those low assessments in 1933, and since that data has been shown to us, the Commissioners, during the last 2 years, have arbitrarily further lowered the assessed value of real estate in Washington \$130,000,000? Did you know that?

Mr. PARKER. I know there have been some decreases; yes.

Mr. BLANTON. When you were employed and had your salary raised to \$800 a month, or \$9,600 a year, did Mr. HARRISON, who is the

chairman of this joint committee, or Mr. DOUGHTON, who is the vice chairman, authorize you to accept outside employment?

Mr. PARKER. Nothing was said about it.

Mr. BLANTON. You talk about other taxes than real-estate taxes. Did you know that the people in your State of Massachusetts, in West Virginia, in Missouri and Iowa and Texas and Pennsylvania and Oklahoma and New York and Virginia and New Hampshire and North Dakota, in addition to having to pay much more than \$1.50 per hundred city tax, which is the total tax that the people of Washington pay for everything, they all have to pay county taxes and State taxes, and in some instances school taxes, water taxes, courthouse, jail, and bridge-bond taxes. You knew that, did you not?

Mr. PARKER. Why, certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. You knew that in addition to the one tax of \$1.50 per \$100 on low assessed value that the Washington people pay for everything, people in other cities sometimes have to pay a special water tax for their water system. Did you know that?

Mr. PARKER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Can you cite me to any city in the United States where the water charge is as low as \$6.60 per year per average family?

Mr. PARKER. I think the water charge here is very low.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, please listen to my questions. You are advertised in the newspapers as a \$9,600-a-year Government expert. You ought to be able to answer a question. You have sat around the hearing table a lot of times. Now, please answer my questions definitely and we will get along.

Can you cite me to any city in the United States where you know that the water charge is as low as \$6.60 per year per average family, which is the charge here in Washington?

Mr. PARKER. No; but I have not made an examination of it.

Mr. BLANTON. Can you cite me to any city in the United States where there is not a sewer-service charge?

Mr. PARKER. No; I cannot, but I could find out.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Parker, did you know that in the District to every family is given an exemption of \$1,000 on household goods?

Mr. PARKER. That is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. Name me another State that has that much of an exemption. In my State it is \$250 on household goods.

Mr. PARKER. I will have to search the records.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you know of another State that gives a \$1,000 exemption?

Mr. PARKER. I cannot recall whether it is more or just that much; I cannot recall.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Parker, did you know that in Washington, to every family, in addition to the exemption of \$1,000 on household furniture, there is exempt from taxation their library, whether it is worth \$5 or \$5,000,000? Did you know that?

Mr. PARKER. I think that is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. That is absolutely exempt from any tax whatever. Will you name me one single State, if you can, where that exemption prevails; where, in addition to the exemption on household furniture, whatever it may be, there is also an exemption from taxes on the family library, regardless of its value? Can you give me one other city like that?

Mr. PARKER. I do not think so. I think that is an unusual provision.

Mr. BLANTON. Let us pass on to another thing. Did you know that in the District of Columbia to every person is given an exemption from taxes on all of their wearing apparel, regardless of its value? That is, in addition to the library exemption, in addition to the \$1,000 exemption on household furniture, there is exempt to each person their wearing apparel, here in the District of Columbia, whether that wearing apparel is worth \$5 or \$5,000,000. Did you know that?

Mr. PARKER. Well, of course, it would be unusual to find \$5,000,000 worth of wearing apparel.

Mr. BLANTON. Now you are getting back into generalities again. I am asking you the question, Did you know that that is the situation?

Mr. PARKER. Yes; I knew that.

Mr. BLANTON. Can you give me the name of any city in the United States other than Washington where there is exempted the wearing apparel of the family?

Mr. PARKER. I do not know any offhand. I do not know what the specific provision of law is.

Mr. BLANTON. Let us get down to the intangible property tax. Did you know that in the District of Columbia there is no estate tax?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, Mr. BLANTON.

Mr. BLANTON. In the city of Washington there is no inheritance tax other than the Federal inheritance tax, is there?

Mr. PARKER. That is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. In the city of Washington there is no gift tax other than the Federal tax, is there?

Mr. PARKER. That is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. And that is applicable to all cities.

In the city of Washington there is no sales tax, such as they have over here in Baltimore and out in Iowa and in West Virginia.

Mr. PARKER. No; no general sales tax.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Parker, in Washington there is no sales tax such as they have in Baltimore, in West Virginia, in Iowa, and in other States, is there?

Mr. PARKER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you know of any place where gasoline is sold where they charge less than 2 cents or even 2 cents a gallon as a tax? Do you know of any State in the Union where that is so?

Mr. BLANTON. Any other city in any State in the Union?

Mr. PARKER. Every State has a gasoline tax; no, I do not recall that.

Mr. JOHNSON. A tax expert ought to be able to answer the question without so much explanation. Do you know of any State in the Union—

Mr. PARKER. That has a lower rate?

Mr. JOHNSON. That pays as little as 2 cents a gallon gasoline tax?

Mr. PARKER. No; I do not.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that the President had that printed in a document called "Comparative Tax Burden in the District of Columbia and Other Cities"?

Mr. PARKER. I have seen it, but I think it is in a different form than that.

Mr. BLANTON. You knew he had it printed?

Mr. PARKER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. You knew he sent that down to Congress with a letter, did you not?

Mr. PARKER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I quote from his letter the following:

"MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am transmitting herewith a report prepared by the Treasury Department at my request on the tax paid by residents of the District of Columbia as compared with taxes paid by residents in other readily comparable cities.

"In general, the Treasury found that the actual money cost of government per capita to residents of the District of Columbia is below that in other cities; likewise the total tax paid by each of several different examples of property owners is lower in the District than in any other cities of between 300,000 and 825,000 population."

Mr. PARKER. That was in connection with the property tax.

Mr. BLANTON. The President sent us this data, and he gives us the tax levy per \$1,000 in each of the following cities:

"Jersey City, N. J., \$40.069 per \$1,000; Boston, Mass., \$37.10 per \$1,000, that is your own city, where you were born; Minneapolis, Minn., \$30.10 per \$1,000; Newark, N. J., \$29.20 per \$1,000; Seattle, Wash., \$28.13 per \$1,000; New Orleans, La., \$27.58 per \$1,000; Baltimore, Md., \$26.70 per \$1,000; Portland, Oreg., \$26.50 per \$1,000; Milwaukee, Wis., \$26.26 per \$1,000; Buffalo, N. Y., \$25.56 per \$1,000; Kansas City, Mo., \$25.23 per \$1,000; Louisville, Ky., \$24.48 per \$1,000; San Francisco, Calif., \$20.09 per \$1,000; Cincinnati, Ohio, \$18.22 per \$1,000; Washington, D. C., \$15 per \$1,000."

Mr. PARKER, when did you ever make a trip to Jersey City, N. J., to investigate that tax rate there?

Mr. PARKER. I never made such a trip to investigate the tax rate.

Mr. BLANTON. When did you ever make a trip to Boston, Mass., to investigate that tax rate there?

Mr. PARKER. I have not investigated any of those.

Mr. BLANTON. When did you ever make a trip to Minneapolis, Minn., to investigate the tax rate there?

Mr. PARKER. I never made a trip to any of those cities for that purpose.

Mr. BLANTON. When did you ever make a trip to Newark, N. J., to investigate the tax rate there?

Mr. PARKER. I never made such a trip.

Mr. BLANTON. When did you ever make a trip to Seattle, Wash., to investigate the tax rate there?

Mr. PARKER. I never made such a trip.

Mr. BLANTON. When did you ever make a trip to New Orleans, La., to investigate the tax rate there?

Mr. PARKER. Never; I have never investigated the tax rate there.

Mr. BLANTON. When did you ever make a trip to Baltimore, Md., to investigate the tax rate in Baltimore?

Mr. PARKER. I never made a trip there for that purpose; I lived there for a short time.

Mr. BLANTON. You never did make a trip there to investigate those tax rates?

Mr. PARKER. No; my reports distinctly do not say that. That would take a lot of time.

Mr. BLANTON. It would take more than \$5,500 worth of employment, would it not?

Mr. PARKER. Much more than that.

It is a very difficult thing to determine the true value and its relation to the assessed value.

Mr. BLANTON. When did you ever make a trip to Portland, Oreg., to make a tax investigation there?

Mr. PARKER. I have never made such a trip. I could make a statement on all of them together.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you ever make a trip to Milwaukee, Wis., to investigate the tax rate there?

Mr. PARKER. I never made such a trip.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you ever make a trip to Buffalo, N. Y., to investigate the tax rate there?

Mr. PARKER. I never made such a trip there.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you ever make a trip to Kansas City, Mo., to investigate the tax rate there?

Mr. PARKER. I never made such a trip.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you ever make such a trip to Louisville, Ky., to investigate the tax rate there?

Mr. PARKER. I make the same answer.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you ever make such a trip to San Francisco, Calif., to investigate the tax rate there?

Mr. PARKER. The answer is the same.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you ever make such a trip to Cincinnati, Ohio, to investigate the tax rate there?

Mr. PARKER. The answer is the same.

Mr. BLANTON. Then you do not know what the Treasury Department did, do you?

Mr. PARKER. Pretty well.

Mr. BLANTON. Have you talked to any of them?

Mr. PARKER. No; but the report shows on its face.

Mr. BLANTON. You never talked with them?

Mr. PARKER. Not about this.

Mr. BLANTON. You have never talked with the President of the United States about that, have you?

Mr. PARKER. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. I happen to know that one of the President's friends in New York bought a \$100,000 piece of property here in Washington, and at the same time bought exactly the same kind of property in New York for \$100,000, and he pays much more taxes on the New York property than he pays in Washington. That is the answer.

Did you know that in addition to the things that the District pays for, with the help of the Government, that there are numerous local matters here in Washington that other cities have to pay for themselves that the Government pays for exclusively, 100 percent? Did you know that?

Mr. PARKER. There are some governmental expenses that they care for.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you know how much money is included in what we call the Interior Department appropriation bill every year for local expenses in Washington that other cities would have to pay for, and that the city of Washington would have to pay for if the Government were not here?

Mr. PARKER. I do not recall the amount.

Mr. BLANTON. You know there is a tremendous amount?

Mr. PARKER. Quite a large sum.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you not know that in practically every one of the 10 appropriation bills that we pass every year there is included a big sum of money that is spent for local improvements in Washington, in a civic way, that other cities would like to have, and for which they would have to pay themselves?

Mr. PARKER. I did not know that was in every bill. There are a number of them which carry it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Did the committee request you to make the report?

Mr. PARKER. The board of trade retained me to make the report.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thought you said the committee.

Mr. PARKER. I am talking about this committee requesting me to come here. I did not volunteer.

Mr. BLANTON. This committee has never asked you to make a tax survey, has it?

Mr. PARKER. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. The subcommittee of the Senate committee handling the District appropriation bill, headed by Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, has never asked you to make a survey of taxes, has it?

Mr. PARKER. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. The only thing you have ever done in connection with taxes in Washington was done at the request of the Washington Board of Trade under your \$5,500 employment?

Mr. PARKER. That is right.

Mr. BLANTON. You knew that the entire pay roll of the Howard University here in Washington is spent in Washington and you knew that that was paid for, 100 percent, by the United States Government, did you not? The District does not have anything to do with that. You know that, do you not?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that this Government spent every dollar of the \$14,750,000 of the cost of the fine Memorial Bridge that goes into Virginia; did you know that?

Mr. PARKER. I suppose they paid for the whole of it.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that this Government paid for all of the fine driveway on the other side of the river that goes to Mount Vernon?

Mr. PARKER. But that is not in the District.

Mr. BLANTON. But the District people use it. You use it all the time as a District man?

Mr. PARKER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. You drive over it with your family there frequently?

Mr. PARKER. Occasionally.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that the fine Lincoln Memorial, with the reflecting pools used for skating by Washington people in winter, which you find visited by such large crowds all the time, was all paid for by the Government of the United States—all that big plant?

Mr. PARKER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that the Washington Monument, which attracts so many people, both from Washington and places outside of Washington, was paid for by the United States Government?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that the Government of the United States has paid every dollar of the cost of this beautiful Supreme Court Building that attracts such large crowds here all the time?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that this fine Congressional Library, with the additional Library building that they are building to the

east of the present building, was paid for wholly by the United States Government?

Mr. PARKER. That is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that right now you will find hundreds of Washington people in the Congressional Library using it, in the reading room?

Mr. PARKER. They have the same use of it as anybody else.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that all of these Government departments here that attract so many people to this city, where there were 600,000 of them here in April, tourists, all of whom spent about \$25 in Washington, on the average—did you know that all of those department buildings were paid for by the Government of the United States and not by the District?

Mr. PARKER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that if this Government plant was not here, that if the Government institutions were not here, that instead of finding this big city here you would find just a little village, like it was when we took it over?

Mr. PARKER. That is probably true.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that when the Government of the United States took over this District of 10 miles square it was just a swamp-ridden, mosquito-ridden village, and they made a beautiful city out of it that attracts hundreds of thousands of people here every month?

Mr. PARKER. Of course, Washington, the city, has been developed by the National Government; there is no question about that.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that the purpose of your \$5,500 employment by the board of trade was to try to get a big lump-sum appropriation for the Government? You knew that, did you not?

Mr. PARKER. No; I did not know that.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Parker, can you state to this committee that you know that France pays one franc of contribution to Paris because of its capital being planted there?

Mr. PARKER. No; but I can report and check up on that.

Mr. BLANTON. I will state to you that it does not.

Did you know that Belgium pays nothing as a contribution for its capital?

Mr. PARKER. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that Germany pays nothing in the way of a contribution for its capital?

Mr. PARKER. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that Great Britain pays absolutely nothing in the way of a contribution that is comparable to the lump sum that the United States pays to Washington?

Mr. PARKER. Great Britain has a system by which they make grants to all of their municipalities.

Mr. BLANTON. You say you know—

Mr. PARKER. I know about Great Britain; I know what they do there; they make grants.

Mr. BLANTON. Great Britain does not pay one dollar contribution. Did you know that Mexico pays nothing in the way of a contribution to its capital?

Mr. PARKER. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that Poland pays nothing by way of a contribution to its capital?

Mr. PARKER. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that Spain pays nothing by way of a contribution to its capital?

Mr. PARKER. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that Sweden pays nothing by way of contribution to its capital?

Mr. PARKER. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that Switzerland pays nothing in the way of a contribution to its capital?

Mr. PARKER. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that Yugoslavia pays nothing in the way of such a contribution?

Mr. PARKER. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that Brazil pays nothing?

Mr. PARKER. No.

Mr. BLANTON. I will state to you that none of these countries pays a dollar comparable to the lump sum that this Government pays to Washington.

Has it occurred to you any time, Mr. Parker, that, drawing a \$9,600 annual salary from the United States Government, especially in view of the fact that you are serving a joint committee of the House and Senate, and that there is a controversy in Congress every year over a lump-sum contribution, and that in the past appropriation bills the Senate has put in whatever the District has asked for, whatever the board of trade has asked for, and the House has had to make a fight to keep it down, that there would be any ethical question involved in your serving the Washington Board of Trade for a \$5,500 fee in a capacity that would be antagonistic to what the House and the Senate might do in this matter?

Mr. PARKER. As I say, when I went into this I went with the idea of making a tax survey and advising them as to taxes only.

Mr. BLANTON. I would suggest this to you, just as one Member of Congress, that as long as you are drawing \$9,600 from this Government in annual salary and serving a joint committee of Congress, as one Member of Congress I would vote to require you either not to take such antagonistic employment, or to quit taking a Government salary. That is the way I feel about it. I feel that your one employment is antagonistic to the other, and it is an interference with the rights of the Government involved here. There is a question of \$3,000,000 involved right now. That is probably what Mr. Colladay had in mind when he made this state-

ment in the hearing before the Senate committee. This colloquy occurred [reading]:

"Senator COPELAND. Are you going to tell us some new things, Mr. Colladay, or some additional reasons, or some old truths proven by new formulas, with a new presentation of the facts?"

"Mr. COLLADAY. Senator COPELAND, if you and the other Senators present were going to make a final report on our case, I would be willing to just file the document which I have just handed to you and submit the case on the brief, but it would seem advisable to make the record a little more fully."

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that it would be outrageously unjust for us to make the people of the United States pay \$5,700,000 on the expenses of the people of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the resolution is divisible, and the Clerk will report the first portion of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Moved, That managers on the part of the House, who, at the request of the Senate, were appointed by the Speaker on April 24, 1936, for a conference with the managers on the part of the Senate, who were appointed by the Senate on April 23, 1936, respecting the disagreeing votes of the two Houses relative to 87 amendments placed by the Senate on the House bill, H. R. 11581, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, have been in conference more than 20 days without avail, said House conferees having been appointed for more than 20 calendar days, and have made no report to the House that they, the said managers on the part of the House be, and they are hereby, instructed as follows:

First. The House instructs its managers to insist on the disagreement of the House to Senate amendment no. 1, which proposes to appropriate \$5,700,000 out of the United States Treasury, as a Federal contribution on the local civic expenses of the District of Columbia, and to insist on the House provision respecting same.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the first part of the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON and Mr. MAVERICK) there were—ayes 142, noes 39.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-six Members present, a quorum.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen from Texas demand the yeas and nays. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Thirty-four Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the first part of the resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the second part of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Second. The House instructs its managers to insist on the disagreement of the House to Senate amendment no. 37-8-9, appropriating \$78,660 for so-called character education, and to insist on the refusal of the House to appropriate any money for so-called character education.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the second part of the resolution.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Fourteen Members have risen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 109, noes 46.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present, and object to the vote upon the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-six Members present, a quorum.

So the second part of the resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the third portion of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Third. The House instructs its managers to insist on the disagreement of the House to Senate amendment no. 83, which struck from the House bill "Sec. 6", which Senate amendment 83 would permit high-salaried judges, high-salaried prosecuting attorneys, high-salaried doctors, and other high-salaried officers and employees, to accept outside employment from others.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the third portion of the resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 86, noes 78.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Twenty-six Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the third portion of the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the votes by which these portions of the resolutions have been agreed to and lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. A special order was granted for this morning. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CHRISTIANSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee to present a conference report.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 267) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of catastrophes of nature, for printing in the RECORD.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to make some observations upon the agricultural problem. You may perhaps consider me presumptuous in so doing, for the subject has been discussed in these halls for years by members much more competent than I. Little if any of what I shall say will have the merit of originality. Nevertheless I feel it my duty before terminating my service in the House to call attention to the fact that after years of thought and effort the problem still remains unsolved.

I wonder if it has occurred to Democrats who have criticized the Republican record and to Republicans who have called attention to the futility of New Deal measures, that Mr. Hoover and Mr. Roosevelt, although employing different expedients, approached the farm problem from the same starting point. The Hoover program and the Roosevelt program were different in detail, but they were based on the same philosophy and were postulated on the same error.

Mr. Roosevelt sought to balance supply and demand by reducing domestic production. Mr. Hoover sought to accomplish the same purpose by segregating and impounding the surplus. Each tried to raise the price by limiting the amount available for consumption, Mr. Roosevelt by keeping wheat from being raised, Mr. Hoover by keeping it from being sold. In the case of cotton the present administration has followed the same procedure its predecessor used in the case of wheat.

Each administration in a large measure failed, because the principle upon which it operated was wrong. Mr. Hoover did not anticipate that products withheld from the market

would nevertheless, so long as they were within the boundaries of the country, have a depressing effect on the market; and Mr. Roosevelt did not foresee that the vagaries of the weather and the disposition of cooperators to "chisel" and of non-cooperators to sow more acres in anticipation of a higher price, would confound the best-meant efforts at regimentation and regulation.

The weakness in the Hoover procedure was that if it raised prices it would also stimulate production and thereby so increase the hoarded surplus that the market would fall faster and harder when it finally collapsed under its own weight. The weakness in the Roosevelt program was that if it accomplished a substantial acreage reduction, it would in the event of drought or other calamity leave the country on short rations and invite the importation of farm products that should have been raised at home.

Each of these administrations failed because it either did not see or refused to see that agriculture in the United States was built up on a surplus basis and therefore cannot be prosperous without an export market, and that it cannot have an export market if the exporter has to compete in purchasing agricultural products with domestic millers buying for a protected home market at prices substantially above the world level.

A one-price system in a surplus producing country whose cost of production is higher than its competitors inevitably presents to the farmer the choice of two alternatives: He may sell in the domestic market at the world price, or he may sell at a protected price and forego the foreign market. In either case he goes broke.

No one has been able to point to any method by which the American producer of such surplus commodities as wheat and cotton can be saved, except by making effective a two-price system under which the farmer would receive a protected price in the home market for whatever is required for home consumption and the world price for the surplus.

What particular mechanism is adopted to accomplish that end is less important than that some such mechanism be adopted.

The payment of export bounties financed by equalization fees is only one of many proposals that have been made.

I am aware that there are some who claim that there are no longer any world markets in which our surpluses can be sold. Chester Davis is the latest recruit in the company of defeatists.

I am not willing to accept the assumption that we cannot sell anything anywhere if we make the price sufficiently attractive.

In making that assertion I am relying on the statements of men who have had years of practical experience in the grain trade, not on the theoretical conclusions of furloughed college professors.

I voted for the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as I did for the so-called Soil Conservation Act, not because I considered it an adequate farm measure but because it was the only proposal for the relief of agriculture for which we were given an opportunity to vote.

I do not condemn A. A. A. in its entirety, for it was not wholly bad; it did give the farmers, especially in the drought-stricken areas, relief that was badly needed. My criticism of it is that it did not go far enough. It gave relief but it did not solve the farm problem, but rather served to complicate it.

It did not any more solve the farm problem than the dole solves the problem of unemployment.

Instead of reducing acreage, it tended rather to shift production from one crop to another, thus creating new dislocations without removing the old ones.

It did not raise the prices of farm products. The increase in prices was accomplished—to the extent it has been accomplished—by 2 years of devastating drought, by the devaluation of the dollar, and by a rise in the world price level.

While it is not only our right but our duty, as the minority, to call attention to the shortcomings and errors of the party in power, it is also our obligation to formulate an alternative program. I hope that it will not be considered too pre-

sumptuous to offer as my own contribution to that program the following recommendations:

First. We should reserve to the farmer his home market by (a) repealing the present Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, and (b) raising duties on agricultural products in instances where export bounties and depreciated currencies have facilitated their shipment into this country. [Applause.]

Second. We should reopen the foreign markets we formerly enjoyed by adopting a two-price system that would enable the farmer to sell his surpluses at competitive world prices without forcing him to accept anything less than a protected price in the domestic market.

Third. We should aim to develop new foreign outlets by facilitating reciprocal trade, and toward that end we should adopt the formula developed by George N. Peek, but rejected by the present administration. The farmer should not be subordinated to industry in the field of foreign commerce, but should be given the opportunity to pay for such imported noncompetitive agricultural products as coffee, tea, cocoa, silk, sisal, and rubber with American agricultural surpluses. Dr. John Coulter, lately of the Tariff Commission, has pointed out that this could be accomplished by imposing exchange restrictions making exchange issued to pay for foreign agricultural products redeemable only when presented in payment for American agricultural products.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLETTE). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am not going to object to the gentleman's request, but so much time has been used today that I will object to any further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Fourth. We should stop the irrigation and reclamation program of the present administration, which has largely if not entirely neutralized its efforts toward acreage reduction. [Applause.] Crop adjustment should start by withholding lands now untilled from cultivation rather than by retiring acres already producing. The Federal Government should discontinue leasing its own land and permitting it to produce in competition with privately owned farms.

Fifth. We should continue along a broader front experiments for discovering and developing new uses for agricultural products, in order that the farmer in the future may share more equitably in that part of the consumer's dollar that is not used to buy food or fiber.

Sixth. We should make provision for the refinancing of farm mortgages at the lowest possible rates of interest, in order that there may be accomplished the two objectives of (a) eventually liquidating the farm mortgage indebtedness and (b) releasing into the channels of commerce and industry farmers' buying power that now goes to and is hoarded by financial institutions. If the farmer is to be subsidized in any way, the subsidy should take the form of relief from a debt burden imposed upon him largely by conditions related to and growing out of the war.

Seventh. We should lower the cost of transporting agricultural products (a) by removing existing restrictions on the reduction of long-haul railroad rates and (b) by opening practicable water channels from the interior to the sea.

Eighth. We might tax agricultural land in this country on the basis of its rental income, as is done in England, rather than on a more or less arbitrarily fixed sales value, and thereby apply to farm taxation the yardstick of "ability to pay." This recommendation, of course, calls for State rather than Federal legislation.

This program looks toward the rehabilitation of agriculture, and rehabilitation is what the farmer wants. He is still the most individualistic of all citizens, and as such is

not satisfied with a dole, no matter how well camouflaged. Put the farmer on a basis of equality with others, and he can and will take care of himself. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 or 4 minutes out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Reserving the right to object, I served notice that I would object to any further requests for time to speak. If somebody wishes to ask unanimous consent to extend their remarks or something like that, that is all right, but I must object to any further request to speak.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

WHERE?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address, delivered by me, on May 25, 1936, which has been slightly extended:

My fellow Americans, in behalf of the National Republican Congressional Committee, I thank the Columbia Broadcasting System for this opportunity to address the American electorate.

Limited time will permit me to explore only a few of the bewildering meanderings of New Deal policies since March 4, 1933. President Roosevelt frequently assures us that "we are on our way." "Where, oh, where?" is the big, baffling question in the minds of the American people.

Do the New Deal generals themselves have a clear conception of what they are trying to do?

We see them negotiating reciprocal-tariff treaties for 3 years, with a professed view to lowering tariffs in every direction—and last week President Roosevelt, by Executive order, belatedly increased tariffs on ruinous imports of cotton goods from Japan. What, then, is the New Deal policy—to lower tariffs or raise them? As a Republican Member of the House of Representatives, I am honored to find the President coming belatedly to embrace the solid Republican principle of protection for American workers and American farmers. Not so his Secretary of State! The people of America will not dismiss lightly the befogged policy which is indicated by this overdue upward revision of the textile tariff after 3 years of frantic efforts to lower our protection in every other sphere.

Similarly, we find the New Deal pursuing vigorously a policy to curtail agricultural production. Hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' hard-earned money have been poured out of the National Treasury to reduce crops. At the same time we find literally hundreds of millions more being poured out of the Treasury at another vent to build gigantic irrigation projects—which will bring hundreds of thousands of new acres into cultivation, to further increase the total agricultural production of the Nation. Such an inconsistent policy is sheer idiocy, and no sane person can make any sense out of such a hodgepodge.

When we find a government raising tariffs and lowering tariffs at the same time—plowing under acreage and bringing new acreage into fertility at the same moment—buying Chinese silver and Mexican silver with good American gold, only to use that silver as a sterile reserve against more and more paper money—when we see these conflicting and contradictory policies being pursued in all directions at once, it is appropriate to pause and ask, "Where is the New Deal heading America? What is the New Deal doing for recovery? What obstacles are being placed in the path of America's sane and orderly progress?"

Again, there is the problem of Roosevelt confusion in relation to our foreign trade in farm products. Producers of every major crop in America virtually have been compelled to reduce their acreage—in the name of balanced agriculture. But how is our agriculture being balanced?

In 1932 American farmers sold 7,886,000 bushels of corn to foreign countries. In addition, they shipped more than 150,000 barrels of corn meal and corn flour. They shipped 12,000,000 pounds of hominy and corn grits. American farm products went to every quarter of the globe. But look at the same picture for the calendar year 1935. The official figures recently have been published by the Department of Commerce. In 1935 we imported 43,242,000 bushels of corn; and we did not export a pound of corn, corn meal, flour, hominy, or corn grits.

Can any citizen of the United States rationalize a program which takes American acres out of production so that the necessary foodstuffs may be imported from foreign farmers?

Consider imports of pork. In 1932, we imported only 29,000 pounds of live hogs, but in 1935 we imported 3,414,317 pounds of live hogs. During the full calendar year 1935 our total imports of pork products of all kinds aggregated 13,908,176 pounds—and this after the New Deal had deliberately slaughtered more than 6,000,000 American hogs in 1933 and 1934!

Putting it another way, we took money from our National Treasury—money which ultimately must be paid in taxes upon every citizen—to destroy millions of pounds of pork, and then made up our consequent deficiency in 1935 food supplies by importing almost 14,000,000 pounds of pork from foreign lands. This is not an agricultural policy. It is, rather, the systematic destruction, the willful undermining of the American economic system. If long pursued, it will mean the utter ruin of the American farmer.

Perhaps the New Deal at heart is not overly solicitous concerning the welfare of American agriculture. You will recall the address of the principal New Deal campaign manager, Postmaster General James A. Farley, a few days ago at Grand Rapids, Mich., in which he referred with eloquent disdain to "a typical prairie State." We people of the great agricultural-producing region of America long have understood the contempt, scorn, and derision in which Tammany holds the great Middle West. We know the eastern city dude ignorantly believes that people out West are nothing but "hicks" and "rubies", only to be laughed at—they laughed at Lincoln!

Many good people of the great prairie States, I may add, appear to reciprocate heartily in their mistrust of the political system of Tammany Hall.

Yet it is illuminating to find the Postmaster General and the chairman of the Democratic National Committee and the chairman of the Democratic State Committee for New York publicly proclaim his sincere contempt for "a typical prairie State."

In the final analysis, however, this unsympathetic attitude of the Postmaster General is not difficult to understand.

The prairie States will be the last in the Union to be Tammanized by the Farley spoils system. Our people believe in fair play.

The prairie States still are fighting for constitutional government. They believe in the Supreme Court.

The prairie States will be the last to ratify the New Deal policy of reckless squandering of the people's money and the Nation's substance. They do not want to mortgage the future of their children; nor do they believe that an artificial, temporary prosperity can long continue by giving the people abnormal "shots in the arm" of their own money, borrowed against their future, which they themselves ultimately must pay back.

The people of the prairie States realize that our Government is not confined to Washington but extends to every hamlet in our land. The people of this country are the Government, and no government can give to its people anything that it does not take from them. Always we must pay for what we get. No kind of government supports its people. Every type of government is supported by its people. Until the advent of the New Deal, our American system of government was the servant and not the master of men.

The people of the prairie States are liberal—but not like Roosevelt and Farley, with other people's money.

The prairie States will be the last in this Union to accept the principle of the boondoggle as the foundation stone of American prosperity. They believe in individual initiative and private enterprise.

The prairie States always have operated on the system of balanced budgets. Nebraska has no State debt today. Kansas has been operating on a balanced budget since 1932. We pay as we go.

The prairie States support an honest and industrious people, and no public slurs and aspersions from Tammany spoilsmen will change the honorable and forthright convictions of that section.

In a little more than 3 years, the New Dealers have increased our national debt by more than \$10,000,000,000, and in spite of this excessive expenditure we will have about 12,000,000 unemployed and 20,000,000 of our people on relief. Nothing is more distressing or demoralizing to an individual or to a nation than to be hopelessly bogged down in the mire of debt. Such a path leads to bankruptcy, repudiation, and loss of individual and national honor.

At the end of the next fiscal year of the Roosevelt administration (1937) our national debt will be in the neighborhood of \$36,500,000,000. This is greater than the value of all the farm lands and farm buildings, the farm machinery, and farm improvements in the United States today. It is estimated that the current value of all farm property is only \$34,500,000,000; but before the New Dealers get through with their reckless extravagance and fantastic bootstrap recovery, the national debt of the United States will exceed this figure by, roundly, \$2,000,000,000.

There is not to be found in all human history a more shocking example of reckless waste. Political expediency and New Deal nostrums, Machiavellian demagoguery and half-baked panaceas are to blame.

The New Deal already has cost us the prosperity and progress of an entire generation. And the Roosevelt administration still has 7 months to go. This New Deal is a fake and a fraud. Its father is trickery, its mother deception, and its offspring corruption. In 1932 it seduced the voters of America and ever since March 4, 1933, it has raped the Government and its people. The voice is the voice of Roosevelt, but the hand is the hand of Farley.

I leave with you the question with which I began, "Where, if anywhere, is President Roosevelt leading our great country?" Shall we continue to own this country, or shall we be owned by it? Shall we remain free men in a republic of representative democracy, or shall we become slaves in a dictatorial bureaucracy or serfs in a regimented communistic society?

In November 1936 every voter must answer this question at the ballot box. Then, I predict, Jim Farley will learn that while the people of the prairie States may have a little hayseed in their hair, they do not have cobwebs in their brain.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk, I may be allowed to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I dislike very much to object to my good friend speaking. I always enjoy what he has to say, but we are expecting to be considering the Robinson-Patman equal-opportunity-in-business bill at that time, and I shall be compelled to object. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his request or make it for some other date.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I modify the request to speak on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk, he may address the House for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS AND SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, about 6 years ago, on June 12, 1930, I made the first speech ever made in the American Congress favoring a national old-age-pension system.

At that time my views were ridiculed in many quarters, but since then the idea has spread among our people by leaps and bounds, so that in 1935 the American Congress passed an Old Age Pension and Social Security Act, and during the same year the legislature of my own State of Maryland passed an Old Age Pension and Social Security Act.

To May 1 in Maryland 7,517 persons are receiving up to \$30 a month—averaging \$17 a month—in old-age pensions, and by the end of the year it is expected that this number will be increased by 4,134, bringing the total up to 11,651 in Maryland alone.

Of course, the present laws are not sufficiently broad in their provisions to provide for all worthy cases, nor are the monthly payments as large as they should be.

A beginning has been made, and those who believe it to be a public disgrace to have the aged and those unable to work dependent on charity will never stop their efforts until every almshouse in the country is empty and for rent. Personally, I will continue to labor for the cause of old-age pensions and social security until we have fully adequate legislation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order that there is no quorum present. Important business is being transacted and we should have a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-four Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 109]

Adair	Curley	Hope	Rayburn
Andrew, Mass.	Darden	Huddleston	Reed, N. Y.
Andrews, N. Y.	Dear	Jenckes, Ind.	Rogers, N. H.
Bacon	Ditter	Kee	Ryan
Barden	Duffey, Ohio	Keller	Sanders, La.
Berlin	Dunn, Miss.	Kennedy, Md.	Sandlin
Bolton	Eaton	Kerr	Schaefer
Brennan	Eckert	Lambertson	Schuetz
Brewster	Englebright	Lanham	Tobey
Brooks	Fenerty	Lee, Okla.	Treadway
Buckley, N. Y.	Ferguson	McGroarty	Turpin
Bulwinkle	Fernandez	McLean	Utterback
Caldwell	Fiesinger	Maloney	Wadsworth
Carmichael	Fulmer	Montet	Werner
Cartwright	Goodwin	Moran	Wigglesworth
Cary	Green	Murdock	Wilcox
Casey	Greenway	Norton	Wilson, La.
Cavichia	Gwynne	O'Connell	Wood
Chapman	Hamlin	O'Neal	Zioncheck
Claiborne	Harlan	Peterson, Fla.	
Clark, Idaho	Hennings	Plumley	
Creal	Hoepfel	Quinn	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and forty Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I served notice that I would object to any further speeches today.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, then I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk, I be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I dislike very much to object to the request of the gentleman from Montana, but the House will consider a bill tomorrow, under a special rule, in which the people of the country are very much interested. I objected to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH] under similar circumstances. I shall be compelled to object, unless the gentleman would change his request to some other date.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak on Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk, for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and the special order heretofore granted, he be allowed to address the House for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SESSIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration may sit during the sessions of the House tomorrow and Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 520.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 520

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 12120, a bill to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY].

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I may be allowed to use the 30 minutes I was to have used yesterday.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I dislike to object to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky, but we are not at all certain that by Friday we shall get through with the bill we are going to take up tomorrow, and it would endanger the passage of that legislation. I ask, therefore, that the gentleman fix another date.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of the two special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 520 from the Committee on Rules provides for the consideration of the vocational-education bill. It is a liberal rule, providing for amendment and for 1 hour of debate to be confined to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, it might be well to have a little background for the consideration of this bill in order that we may know the purpose of the resolution. This bill provides for the authorization of \$18,000,000—\$6,000,000 is to be used for the year ending June 30, 1937; \$6,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1938; and \$6,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1939. It is a continuation of the program for vocational education and is divided three ways—for training along agricultural lines, along the line of home economics, and for training in industry.

Mr. Speaker, the first legislation of this character goes back to 1918, when the Smith-Hughes Act was passed, which contributed \$500,000 for training in agriculture and \$500,000 for industrial training. The Smith-Hughes Act was followed by the George-Elzey Act in 1934, providing \$3,000,000 a year; but that act expires this year; and it is for the continuation of this work that the increase from \$3,000,000 to \$6,000,000 is proposed in this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will opportunity be afforded to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill?

Mr. GREENWOOD. The rule does not so provide; but I have discussed the matter with the Parliamentarian and understand that after the first section of this bill is read the Senate bill could be offered as an amendment. The rule provides that the bill is wide open for amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say to the gentleman from Indiana that a number of Members would like to see the Senate bill substituted for the House bill.

Mr. GREENWOOD. There are several members of the committee who would like to see the same thing done, and I believe the parliamentary situation will be such as to permit its being done, even though the rule does not specifically provide for it.

Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the merits of this character of education. Most of the States have a very elaborate system of academic education, of schooling along scientific and educational lines, but it is only within the last few years that we have recognized the great necessity for educating not only the younger, but even the older people along scientific lines in trades and vocations. Perhaps the emergency that arose from the depression when there was so much unemployment brought more vividly to our minds the necessity of educating people in order that they may be able to earn a livelihood; and this bill proposes a permanent program along the lines already undertaken. The unemployment situation in many States and the extra burden that has been thrown upon the States has required this Federal aid on a 50-50 basis. I think the Federal Government is equally interested with the States in helping place the youth, the men and women, and even those of adult age, in a position where they may be able to earn a livelihood through having a better understanding of the different vocations. Many of the States have undertaken this program but would have to abandon it if Federal aid is not continued as proposed by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, three very basic features of life are covered by this bill: First, farming, going back to our greatest of natural resources, the soil. Agricultural education has one-third of the privileges and appropriations authorized in this legislation. The conservation of the soil is perhaps the greatest necessity confronting any nation that has a large population to insure the future perpetuity of the race. We have in the Orient many examples of nations which have neglected their soil, nations like China and the Asiatic countries, where the population has increased rather phenomenally, but where a soil is so depleted that hunger and starvation is constantly menacing the future of the people. In our Nation, of course, the farm population, dependent on the soil, is the largest single group. Then the bill also undertakes to encourage the teaching of new methods in the home. There are perhaps better methods than we have known in the past which have been brought about through discovery and invention, and the necessity arises for organizing the home upon an economic basis in order to care for the necessities, in order to take care of living under present circumstances; health, sanitation, and home management, all these subjects appeal, I think, to the entire membership of the House. Then, in this mechanical age, this age of invention and discovery, the trade a man learned at 10, 12, or 15 years ago may be of no further use to him; it does not stand him so well in stead to earn a livelihood under present economic conditions.

So it is going to accommodate modern life to the situation as we now find it, which grew out of the depression and out of the advancement that has come through the years. This particular type of education is greatly needed and is being popularized in various States because the youth of the country desire to learn something whereby they may earn their own livelihood by the use of their hands. I think it is very laudible that the Federal Government is putting up 50 percent of these funds so that the States may meet the appropriation and take advantage of this class of education. I trust the rule may be adopted and the bill enacted into law.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the subject of vocational education is not a new one in this country. More than 19 years have passed since the original act was adopted by the Congress of the United States, and it is now permanent

legislation. Under the Smith-Hughes Act the States receive \$7,157,000 each year and, as pointed out by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GREENWOOD], this bill is supplemental and is offered to carry on the program inaugurated under the original Smith-Hughes Act. I am deeply interested in the subject of vocational education. The Members of the House will notice that in the House bill now under consideration only 3 years are provided for with \$6,000,000 appropriated each year. It was the thought of the committee, after due consideration, that instead of making this permanent legislation it should be made for the span of 3 years so that at the end of that time it would be better known what should be done and what provision should be made with reference to either curtailing the subject of vocational education or increasing and broadening its scope.

I may say in passing that this bill comes before the House with the unanimous report of the Committee on Education. There is no dissenting opinion. The \$6,000,000 provided each year is to be divided three ways among the States. If this bill becomes law, taken with the Smith-Hughes Act, it means that each State would receive only \$274,000 if the money is allocated or allotted equally. If this bill does not become law, and we carry on under the Smith-Hughes Act, then if the money is divided equally the States would receive about \$150,000 each.

I am fully aware of the fact that the Senate of the United States has passed a similar bill, and I understand a movement is on foot in the House to offer the Senate bill as an amendment to the pending House bill. The Senate bill carries an appropriation of \$12,000,000 each year and is permanent legislation, while the House bill carries an appropriation of only \$6,000,000 each year. I may say to the House that the Committee on Education held hearings on this bill, and so far as the testimony offered before that committee is concerned, there was nothing presented to justify the inclusion of an annual appropriation of \$12,000,000; therefore, it was the unanimous judgment of the committee that \$6,000,000 is ample, for the reason that the George-Ellzey Act, which expires in another year—and this bill is offered in lieu of that—carried but \$3,000,000, while this bill doubles that amount.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The committee has given consideration to the Senate bill. Was it studied by the House committee?

Mr. DONDERO. I may say to the gentleman that the Senate bill and its provisions were known to the committee, or at least the substantial provisions of it, and the same were discussed by our committee.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman does not intend to convey the impression in his statement that the committee was unanimously opposed to the provisions of the Senate bill?

Mr. DONDERO. No. My statement is that the committee was of the unanimous opinion that the House bill was the right kind of a bill to bring before the House at the present time.

Mr. PALMISANO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. PALMISANO. House bill 10190 was identical with the Senate bill. The gentleman who introduced the so-called George bill in the Senate then introduced the bill which is now pending before the House.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. There is another major difference between the House and Senate bills, as, of course, the gentleman knows. The Senate bill provides that a certain proportion of these funds shall be made available to the States without matching.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. TARVER. It strikes me that the provisions of the Senate bill are perhaps more meritorious than the mere increase in the amount which is made available, in that it tends to give to States which may not be able to match Federal funds some opportunity to participate under the provi-

sions of this legislation. Will the gentleman discuss that feature of the Senate bill?

Mr. DONDERO. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that the question of matching funds, of course, is one that is vital to the States which feel they cannot appropriate sufficient money to meet the Federal aid. I call attention to the fact that the House bill attempts simply to supplement the Smith-Hughes Act and the George-Ellzey Act and carries out the same policy and the same principle involved in the Smith-Hughes Act, namely, that the States shall match dollar for dollar the money provided by the Federal Government in aid to the States.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman just stated there was no evidence given to the committee to justify an expenditure in excess of \$6,000,000. Does the gentleman recall Mr. John C. Wright, Assistant Commissioner for Vocational Education, appearing before the committee?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. COX. Did the gentleman hear him make the following statement:

I might add one statement, Mr. Chairman, and that is that the States spent up until this past year, 1935, \$3 of their own money for every dollar of Federal money.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; and I call attention to the fact the testimony also showed that for every dollar of Federal money only \$1.39 was spent by the States. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Georgia, may I say further that when Mr. Wright appeared before the committee and we asked him to justify the \$12,000,000, he substantially said to the committee:

I am here, but I cannot talk.

Mr. DEEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DEEN. I would like to correct the gentleman's statement, and he is making a very splendid speech. He stated that Mr. Wright, who appeared before the committee, could not justify or could not talk about this legislation. Is it not a fact that under the Budget and Accounting Act, heads of departments have to get permission from the President before they may make recommendations under these bills?

Mr. DONDERO. That is possible, if the hearings show it, but I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that so far as it applies to the Senate bill, and so far as I am able to learn, the Senate never even held any hearings on the bill it passed.

Mr. DEEN. I am informed by distinguished Senators that there was no objection on the Senate side, and therefore no hearings were held.

Mr. DONDERO. There were no hearings whatever, and therefore they had no testimony before them on which to base the amount of \$12,000,000, and to run this up from \$3,000,000 to \$12,000,000 means an increase of 300 percent in 1 year. The committee did not think this was wise, and I believe the amount is entirely in excess of the requirements.

So far as it affects my own State, I have searched the records and have found that in my own State of Michigan we have 222 schools teaching agriculture.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Michigan, 2 more minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. In the 222 schools, I find that nearly 47,000 of our young people have found not only instruction but benefit. This particular instruction has touched 1,250,000 people of the Nation, mostly young people graduating from high schools. It has aided the boys and girls on the farm and in the city alike. This bill and the underlying principle of the bill reach into the homes of the people of the cities, those who live in nonfarm homes, and reaches out into the country in the most remote recesses, and gives aid and benefit to the young people of the Nation.

I have a very interesting statement here from my own State, with regard to the benefits of this form of legislation

principally to the young people, and I want to read from the Michigan State Farm Bureau a brief paragraph written to me April 30, 1936, in which that bureau says:

At the present time in Michigan, there are approximately 3,000 young farmers who have graduated from the agricultural departments of the high schools in Michigan. I desire to report to you that vocational agriculture is quietly and effectively changing the type and caliber of the men who now run our Michigan farms.

And what I can say about Michigan, undoubtedly every Member of the House can say about the young farmers in his State.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 more minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. One statement further:

There can be no greater testimony to the effectiveness of this work, than when I tell you that a questionnaire to these young people composing the Farm Bureau Junior League indicates that better than 75 percent are graduates of vocational agriculture and that of this 75 percent but 10 percent have indicated a desire to leave the farm should an opportunity arise.

I think if nothing was before me except this statement showing a desire on the part of the young men and the boys of the country to stay on the farm, this would be sufficient alone to warrant my support of the legislation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman, who, I understand, is a member of the committee, have anything in the RECORD to support the contention recently made that this vocational work closed one of the large industries in my particular district of the State of Michigan?

Mr. DONDERO. No such information was before the committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman knows the case to which I refer?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think I do.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The charge was made by our Governor that vocational education funds were used for the purpose of closing a large industry at Portland, Mich., throwing out of employment some 600 people. I have been very much concerned about it, because I have been a friend of this legislation and have spoken in behalf of it, but at the same time I wanted to find out from the gentleman if he has found anything in the records which supports the alleged claim that this vocational education fund is being used for the purpose of closing industries in the State of Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. No such information has reached me and neither has any such information come before our committee, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I simply wish to observe that the gentleman has made such a splendid argument, he has convinced me we ought to adopt the Senate bill rather than the House bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Let not our enthusiasm run away with the Treasury of the United States. Let us keep our feet on the ground.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. I am in favor of the legislation, but I wonder if the gentleman thinks that \$6,000,000 is sufficient to carry through the program. Was there any evidence presented to the gentleman's committee that this would not be enough money?

Mr. DONDERO. I will say to the gentleman that this is an increase of 100 percent over the appropriation of last year and we feel that an increase of 300 percent is far in excess of any requirement presented to our committee.

Mr. HOUSTON. How does this affect the hundreds and thousands of young men and women roaming around the

country out of employment? Do they participate in this fund?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think they could all be absorbed. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. But I think a part of them could be absorbed if they sought aid under this particular kind of program.

Mr. HOUSTON. Just how would it work?

Mr. DONDERO. That is a matter of set-up in the various States, the Federal Government simply cooperating with the States in their program.

Mr. HOUSTON. I am very much in favor of the program.

Mr. CITRON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. CITRON. Section 6 of the House bill is the protective clause against utilizing any vocational money for services of vocational trainees for private profit. Has the Senate bill a similar protective provision?

Mr. DONDERO. No; not in any way.

On page 3 you will find in the Senate bill provisions which include public and other service occupations. Testimony before our committee established a situation where that identical thing occurred in which individuals were trained for the purpose of giving aid to enhance private profit. That provision—section 6 of the House bill—is to preclude public money being used for that purpose.

The Senate bill does not include that safeguard. Let me make one more observation. I have before me a letter from the superintendent of public schools in Pontiac, Mich., in which he says:

Here in Pontiac, where the training of boys for the automotive industry is of such pressing importance, but where local ability to finance the needed extension of vocational training is so restricted, the provisions of the bill would make possible a splendid service to our youth.

That is signed by James H. Harris, superintendent of schools.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MASSINGALE. In the hearings before your committee, was there any evidence to the effect that a large number of vocational-training schools had to close throughout the Nation for lack of funds, and that that is the reason why the Senate increased the amount?

Mr. DONDERO. I think the Senate bill was passed before the House had concluded the hearings and before the bill was reported for consideration.

I can say that the testimony before our committee was most conclusive; that the gentleman's State of Oklahoma had received tremendous benefits from the funds allocated to the State of Oklahoma under this form of legislation, keeping many people off the relief roll.

Mr. MASSINGALE. I grant that, but the gentleman has not quite answered my question. I know that in Oklahoma dozens and dozens of vocational training schools had to close because the appropriation was not sufficient for them to carry on.

Mr. DONDERO. It is possible that the demand of the schools in your State was greater than the allocations of funds. I am not satisfied that this will be a panacea for all ills.

Mr. MILLARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MILLARD. What is the provision as to how the money shall be divided?

Mr. DONDERO. It will be divided in three ways, which you will find in section 1 of the bill. Six million dollars each year for 3 years, beginning July 1, 1937. One-third in proportion—farm population bears to the total farm population of the United States; one-third in proportion to rural population; one-third in proportion to non-farm-population States to match amount.

Mr. MILLARD. How much would New York State get out of that?

Mr. DONDERO. I am not able to go into the detail of that. I hope the House bill will pass; we could not spend that amount of money to any better advantage.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I take it that there is no serious opposition to the adoption of the rule. If I sense the feeling of the membership, it is that the most of us, if not practically all of us, are very much interested in the enactment of the pending bill or legislation of that type. Probably the only controversy that will arise will be over whether or not the Senate bill be substituted for the bill reported by the House committee, which is the bill that the pending rule is intended to make in order. I desire to go directly to the argument of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dondero], who has just addressed the House, in which he opposes the substitution of the Senate bill upon the ground that there was nothing by way of evidence submitted to his committee indicating a need for the money. I have made some little investigation of this subject matter, and I say to you that the information that I have obtained is that there is very great need for the money authorized to be appropriated in the Senate bill, because there are a great many people anxious for the training this activity provides, who have no hope of ever obtaining it with the money provided in the House bill. The present need is greater than it has ever been before. The records reveal that 1,129,000 students are now enrolled in vocational-education classes in the United States. A recent check-up in the various States reveals that more than 5,900 rural high schools in the United States need vocational education in agriculture, and, it should be understood, this bill provides for vocational education in agriculture, trade, and industry, and in home economics. It is conservatively estimated that if funds were available more than 6,000,000 people would be reached in vocational education.

The situation in Arkansas is typical. In that State at the present time there are 478 rural consolidated high schools, in which 110 departments of vocational agriculture are maintained under the present funds. There are on file 200 applications for additional departments in the State office of Arkansas at the present time. For the benefit of people coming from the larger cities it should be understood that the fund authorized to be appropriated by this bill is not to be expended wholly or entirely in rural communities but that it goes to the equal benefit of those and to an equal extent for those living in the cities. The greatest school of this type which we have in the country is the one located at Buffalo, and while it is probably the largest of this type of the city schools nevertheless it is typical of all the rest. The time at my disposal is not sufficient to enable me to develop in detail the argument that I would like to make to support the proposition that there is need for the funds provided in the Senate bill. I think we would commit a very serious mistake in not accepting the Senate bill in lieu of the House bill. It is a bill that my colleague, Mr. DEEN, of Georgia, introduced, and it is the bill upon which the hearing was had by the committee. Congress, in this kind of legislation, has done and is seeking to do something for the working people who are ambitious to improve their own opportunities and condition. This is an activity that does something for working people, something for the boys on the farm, something for country girls, something for ambitious and poor laboring boys in the cities. Let us render the finest service that it is possible for us to render to this very deserving class by substituting the Senate bill for the House bill when the opportunity offers itself in the consideration of the House bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I was interested in the statement the gentleman made in reference to the number of applications for such vocational schools in the State of Arkansas. Has the gentleman the figures for the entire United States, and particularly for the State of Oklahoma?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have not the figures for the entire country available here at hand, nor do I recall the figures for the State of Oklahoma; but Arkansas, I may say to the gentleman, is typical of all the States, and it is not the rural agricultural States alone that are interested, but States like New York.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. SIROVICH. As I understand the debate, the House bill makes it mandatory for every State to match the amount of money the Government gives. Does the Senate bill do the same?

Mr. COX. The Senate bill provides that for the years 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, and 1941, I believe, the States shall contribute 50 percent of the amount contributed by the Federal Government; for the year 1942 they shall contribute 60 percent—that is, the States or the local communities—and for the year 1943, 70 percent; for 1944, 80 percent; for 1945, 90 percent; and thereafter an equal amount.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. TERRY. I am very much interested in the splendid statement made by my colleague. I know that in my State of Arkansas a number of schools in various counties will not be able to have this vocational work unless the Senate bill is adopted.

Mr. COX. That is very true. With respect to my own county, which is an agricultural community, there are two or three schools in which vocational training is carried on, but there are other schools wanting the service. Let me say this to you: I have seen the effect of the work of these vocational teachers and what they have done with boys and girls in my home county.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Were the figures which the gentleman gave with reference to Arkansas the number of applications pending that are not now receiving aid?

Mr. COX. Now in the State offices there are pending 200 applications.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Which are not now receiving aid?

Mr. COX. And cannot be accommodated.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Now, if we do not substitute the Senate bill and only make an appropriation of \$6,000,000, as provided by the House bill, then those applications cannot be taken care of?

Mr. COX. They cannot be taken care of, because you will understand that \$3,000,000 of the \$6,000,000 has already been allocated; that is, contracted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And that is true with reference to the other States of the Union, with reference to applications pending? They cannot be taken care of either?

Mr. COX. That is very true.

I want to complete the statement I started to make a few moments ago. It is not only Arkansas, Alabama, and Georgia and the other agricultural States that are benefited, but it is the great populous communities, like the great city of New York and others.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has expired.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER].

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the legislation now before the House. I believe that the money

expended in such a worthy cause is most commendable, and I am heart and soul in favor of the objects of this act and what it will do for the young people of the country.

I wish to speak briefly, however, upon another subject, and I ask the indulgence of the House while I digress from the subject of this debate in order to bring to the attention of the House a matter which is very likely to be of profound consequence to this country during the coming summer.

The matter to which I refer promises to assume the gravest proportions in certain areas of the country and it has nothing whatever to do with the favorite seasonal sport of this year—politics.

For several years, and notably 2 years ago, certain parts of the Central Western States have been devastated by a pest of grasshoppers. All at once they have appeared in alarming numbers in the valley of the Kaw or Kansas River just west of Kansas City, Kans. Here 6,000 acres of land devoted to truck gardens are threatened with certain destruction. Only immediate succor will prevent the loss of over a million dollars' worth of vegetables which supply the Kansas City (Mo.) and Kansas City (Kans.) markets. This has not happened in the Kaw Valley since 1874.

The Secretary of Agriculture told me Saturday morning that no funds were available for this purpose and no bait or poison mash available for the purpose of fighting this plague. This bait, which consists of a mixture of bran, sorghum, or other similar sweet liquid, and paris green or other arsenical poison, is scattered over the gardens or fields affected to the degree of about 50 pounds per acre. These truck gardeners have exhausted their credit to finance seeding and planting, and any aid that will help them must be immediate; but so far neither myself nor the Kansas Senators have found the source of any immediate relief.

However, we are still seeking some accessible funds so that these hard-working people may proceed with their work of supplying the markets of the two Kansas Cities and other places with fine vegetables. This valley of the Kaw is as rich as the Nile, but the grasshoppers at this time threaten to absolutely devastate the whole area devoted to the production of vegetables for market.

Before this Congress adjourns it should appropriate from \$250,000 to a half million dollars, making it available to the Secretary of Agriculture to combat the scourge which at this time threatens to destroy the products of this highly developed land. Should we fail to do this there is a highly probable necessity of calling a special session of Congress to enact legislation to protect the farms and gardens of the country from the blight of grasshoppers.

A wide area, which I saw mapped at the office of Secretary Wallace, will be subject to these pests, and on account of the dry season may assume gigantic proportions before the summer is over. If we should adjourn before this money is appropriated we may have to be called back, as I have said, to deal with the emergency this situation threatens. Montana, the Dakotas, Minnesota, Nebraska, and other Western States are threatened.

This money should be made available for use by Secretary Wallace to meet this situation if and when it arrives. I introduced a joint resolution last Friday, providing for an appropriation of \$20,000 to meet the Kansas situation at once. These producers are small farmers and depend upon their gardens for a livelihood. The failure of their gardens on this land of the Kaw bottoms would mean destitution for hundreds of families who operate these truck farms. Congress has the power to aid these people, and it is comparatively a simple matter to kill these pests with poison bait; but the producers cannot themselves furnish the poison bait. The Government in exterminating the pests there at Kansas City will prevent the spread and propagation upon wider areas.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUYER. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. I will agree with the gentleman and support his bill if he will include therein the eradication of the bindweed.

Mr. GUYER. They have remedies for the bindweed. It is a terrible thing and it is becoming a great scourge.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUYER. I yield.

Mr. SIROVICH. What is the chemical formula of the poison bait?

Mr. GUYER. It is bran, sorghum, and paris green. I have used it myself on my alfalfa fields, and it is absolutely effective. It requires about 50 pounds to the acre.

Mr. SIROVICH. Does it not poison other animals?

Mr. GUYER. No; it does not. It is so thinly distributed and so little arsenic in it that no domestic animal would be injured by it. It probably might poison birds if they would get enough of it, which is very doubtful.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUYER. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. Is it not possible, in view of the fact that this is a small project, involving the expenditure of only \$20,000, that it might be taken care of by some existing agency? For example, the W. P. A.?

Mr. GUYER. W. P. A. requires that 90 percent of it shall be spent for labor. That would not be the case here. We went all over that.

Mr. MEAD. Is there not any possible relief from the State of Kansas itself, through the Governor or through existing laws?

Mr. GUYER. I think possibly there might be, though I know nothing about that. There probably will be, but that remains to be seen.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I deem this measure one of the most important that has come before this Congress. We must confess that the old day is gone, and with the passing of the old day we have witnessed the passing of the old systems. One reason we find ourselves at this hour in the throes of the depression is the fact that some years ago we did not have the vision to see that the old systems were passing and that with new, scientific methods and modern technology they had to go. Not recognizing these facts, we failed to educate and to prepare our people for the new, scientific, technological day in which we live.

Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration would provide funds for education in agriculture, for education in the industries and the trades, and for education in home economics. The farm population of this country has increased during the depression by some 20 or 30 percent. Thousands of men who went into our cities to work in the shops and industries have been forced back on the farms. These men have got to be educated and trained through vocational education to make their own livelihood. In the cities we find millions of men walking the streets, thrown out of jobs on account of machines. These unemployed have got to be trained for new vocations and new trades.

We have been spending billions of dollars for relief to the unemployed and those in distress. Why should we not today authorize the appropriation of \$12,000,000 in an effort to get at least some of these people back to work? The good American citizen does not want relief, does not want a dole; what he wants is the opportunity to make his own livelihood. While we are spending billions of dollars on relief we ought to be able to spend \$12,000,000 to help train and educate these people to make their own living.

It is conservatively estimated that there are in this country today at least 6,000,000 people who would take advantage of vocational education if they only had the opportunity. There are some 9,300 rural schoolhouses scattered throughout the country that want and need to offer courses in vocational education, and which would do so if they could only get the funds necessary to carry on the work.

The record shows that under the vocational-education program 80,000 farm boys, that is, future farmers of America, have taken vocational agricultural courses and have participated in the rehabilitation and readjustment of their farm family problems. Boys and girls, in city and in country, have

been training and preparing themselves to earn their daily bread and to play their part as citizens and in the work of the world.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Of the thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars the Federal Government has expended during these latter years in the State of Alabama, nothing has done more for our people, nothing has proved more beneficial than the help given in vocational education under the wise and able leadership of Dr. J. B. Hobdy of our State department of education. Through our vocational-education program we are helping the men and women of Alabama to find themselves, to readjust themselves, to see and to obey the economic traffic lights; and we are helping them to come back and to earn their own livelihood. Let us appropriate the \$12,000,000, for "where there is no vision the people perish." [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEEN].

Mr. DEEN. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to give a history of the legislation in this brief time, but I do want to call the attention of the House to a few facts. The pending bill, H. R. 12120, was considered by the Committee on Education of the House in its original form as the bill H. R. 10190. The committee held hearings for 2 or 3 days; and it is illuminating and interesting to read the hearings and to find that in one community in the State of Arkansas last year it was testified to by a representative of vocational training in Arkansas that 250 beef cattle were canned in that given community, and 50,000 pounds of fruits and vegetables were canned in a vocational training school and community, and that not a person in that community had been on relief at any time in the past 3 or 4 years. It was also testified to by a representative of vocational education from my own State that in one of the communities in Georgia last year a sufficient amount of fruits, vegetables, and meats were canned and preserved to take care of the people during the winter, and that not a person in that community had been on relief any time since 1933. This is due to the work of vocational training and vocational education.

It was interesting to me to note that in the hearings it was developed that there are approximately 8,000,000 people in the United States today who would like to have training in vocational education, either in agriculture, or in the trades and industries, or in home economics.

I call the attention of the Members to pages 24 and 25 of the hearings, where is shown the distribution of the vocational-education funds supplied under both the George-Elzey Act and the Smith-Hughes Act. It will be found that one-third of the money has gone to vocational training in agriculture, one-third to vocational training in the trades and industries, and one-third to training in home economics.

I call the attention of the House also to page 60 of the hearings, to a statement by Mr. Wright, a representative of the vocational-education office in Washington. When the chairman asked if there were any further questions Mr. Wright said:

I might add one statement, Mr. Chairman, and that is that the States spent, up until this past year, 1935, \$3 of their own money for every dollar of Federal money.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, the pending bill (H. R. 12120) originally was H. R. 10190, the bill considered by the committee, and identical with Senate bill S. 2883, which has passed the Senate. I hope the membership of the committee and of the House will at the proper point substitute the Senate bill for my bill. [Applause.] I have no pride in authorship, but I am concerned about the destinies of 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 people who are on our hands but who want to get on their own feet. The only way to get them off the hands of the taxpayers is to put them on their own feet and the best way of getting people off of relief and keeping them off is to give them some training in a profession or business that will enable them to make a living. No American with pride, and most of them have pride, wants to be on relief.

They want work and they are entitled to it.

Mr. Speaker, at the proper time, when the Senate bill is offered as a substitute for my bill, I hope that the House will adopt it.

Mr. BEITER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman has given some very illuminating figures and I want to point out some interesting figures, also. Out of 6,217 who will graduate from the public elementary schools of Buffalo this June, some 2,259 have signified their intention of taking up this vocational work.

Mr. DEEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MILLARD. What is included in home economics?

Mr. DEEN. Does the gentleman mean what is meant by home economics?

Mr. MILLARD. Yes.

Mr. DEEN. The canning of fruits, vegetables, and so forth; teaching of sewing, cooking, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, I want the Members of the House to note this, and I am sure they are entitled to the information. The Committee on Education of the House after several executive sessions reported my bill which calls for an appropriation of \$6,000,000 for each of the 3 years beginning on July 1, 1937, and including \$6,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1938 and 1939. It was in the form of a compromise bill. I did not vote for the \$6,000,000. I did not vote for my bill. I wanted \$12,000,000, the same as is provided for by the Senate bill, and I believe my colleagues on the committee know that. I am not bound to any other agreement by anyone in committee, and neither is anyone else bound. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE RANDOLPH PERKINS

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state to the Members of the House that the name of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KENNEY] was inadvertently omitted as a member of the committee appointed to attend the funeral of our deceased colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PERKINS]. The Chair now announces the appointment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KENNEY] as a Member of the committee in addition to the members already named.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to quote therein the evidence of Mr. Hazen and Mr. Parker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE YOUTH PROBLEM IN CRIME

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by Edgar Hoover to the Boys' Club in Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following address by John Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, before the Thirtieth Annual Convention of the Boys' Club of America, Philadelphia, Pa., 9:15 p. m., May 20, 1936. This speech should be read to or read by every boy and girl in America. It should also be read by every father and mother.

In appearing before you, the patrons and supporters of the Boys' Clubs of America, I hope that I am addressing the entire country. The problems of youth in crime which I shall discuss are not limited to sectional or local boundaries—they reach from border to border and coast to coast. They disclose a malign threat over every

home in this Nation. They reveal a tremendous responsibility which should be undertaken by our every citizen. They are the problems which confront us because of the awful fact that a great part of today's crime is committed by our youth.

WHY CHILDREN COMMIT CRIMES

We have youth in crime because we have failed to provide youth with proper outlets and upbringing. Only in the rarest instances of diseased minds can we say that the first offender commits crimes out of sheer antisocial sentiments. Children are driven to crime because of deep-laid faults in society such as poverty, degeneracy, and because their elders neglect them.

When youth commits a crime, generally it is because older persons have committed a greater crime; it is because of laxity in early discipline; because of apathy on the part of parents and neglect by those of the community who should help the helpless; because of distorted views held by those who should know better and who have allowed adolescent minds to take a downward direction which can lead only to destruction.

TWENTY PERCENT OF CRIME COMMITTED BY THOSE UNDER VOTING AGE

Today, as you know, 20 percent of our crime is the work of persons who have not yet even reached the voting age. This means that one-fifth of all murders, of arson, thievery, robbery, and the other malignant outrages against our commonwealth are committed by persons of immature bodies and immature minds, persons who should be reaching the threshold of useful life. However, this 20 percent falls tragically short of the ideal of American citizenship. It is not a pleasant picture. It is not a healthful outlook. It is not a normal condition when a nation such as America must bow under the disgrace of a set of circumstances in which one-fifth of our most deadly outlaws, our murderers, our machine-gunning desperadoes, are little beyond childhood. It becomes incumbent upon all of us, therefore, to recognize and admit the causes for such scandalous conditions, and, reaching beyond, to search for the means by which they may be remedied.

CAUSE OF DISRESPECT FOR LAW

I believe that a prime factor in the disregard by youth for law lies in an equal or greater disrespect for law and order on the part of the adult of our generation. Seek to evade it though you may; seek to apologize; seek to excuse yourselves; nevertheless, upon the shoulders of grown-up America rests the burden for this condition. You may allege that youth has made a hero of the gangster. I insist that no youth ever developed a heroic ideal that was not first centered about his father or his mother, and when the youngster begins to show disrespect of law and order you can be sure that he learned something of that attitude at home or because those in his home failed to keep him in the right company and isolated from bad examples.

BOILING POT OF UNDERWORLD

I have only to look at the stack of mail upon my desk since the capture of Alvin Karpis, Harry Campbell, William Mahan, and Thomas H. Robinson, Jr., to realize that these blots of scum from the boiling pot of the underworld were looked upon by many persons as worthy of emulation. These correspondents express sorrow for the "poor" kidnapers, and regret that they must be placed behind bars. This is what usually happens when the Federal Bureau of Investigation eradicates what I prefer to call not "public enemies" but "public rats." Each of them has his audience like a motion-picture star; each of them has his public; each of them has his great gathering of sentimental yammerheads, who utter remonstrances at his apprehension and detection. So long as that asinine behavior continues, I insist that the crime problem, as affects youth today, is also a crime problem involving the moronic adults of this country, who, through ill-considered actions and idiotic idolatry of cowardly outlaws, develop an ever-increasing tendency toward crime by the youth of America.

COMBAT INHERENT CRIMINAL WORSHIP

Our first problem, therefore, is to change this mistaken attitude; to carry on a campaign of education through which the unthinking American shall be forced to realize his disgrace in looking upon men of desperate crime as anything other than what they really are—the lowest dregs of society. This can be accomplished. Indeed, I take pleasure in informing you that while thousands expressed sorrow at the eradication of Dillinger, only hundreds lamented the capture of Alvin Karpis or Campbell or Mahan or Robinson. Our job is to steadily reduce that number until such maudlin sentiment is nonexistent. Once this is done, we truly can throw our every effort into keeping boys and girls out of jail. We must work with a dual purpose, never failing to realize that while we combat the growth of criminal instincts in youth, we also must combat the inherent criminal worship in many of our men and women.

BUILDING NEW VIEWPOINT

We of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are constantly working toward not only the capture and conviction of the enemies of society, but toward the building of a new viewpoint which we hope will result in fewer violators of the law. It was toward this end that sometime ago, with the assistance of the law-enforcement agencies of America, we began the compilation of crime statistics, not as mere figures, but as guideposts in our endeavor to combat the degradation of otherwise good citizens. We have no desire to be known solely as hunters of men; we would much rather be looked upon as preventers of crime.

PRIDE IN HONESTY RATHER THAN WORSHIP FOR GANGSTER

Behind the spectacular efforts of the Bureau in its necessary campaigns against the more desperate of our outlaws lies the never-failing desire to build a barrier between the law and its violation. We have no happier days in the Federal Bureau of Investigation than when vast throngs of boys under the guidance of friendly special agents are taken through the big building and are shown how we operate. We hope our young visitors will take pride in honesty rather than worship for the gangster thereafter. We hope to see the day when every law-enforcement officer in America will realize that the best weapon against crime is a feeling of confidence and friendship upon the part of every boy and girl in his neighborhood.

SPECIAL AGENTS CAREFULLY SELECTED

It is our ideal to possess in the 37 nationally distributed field divisions of the Federal Bureau of Investigation a type of special agent whose history has been traced almost from babyhood to assure us that he is an upright, honest, courageous citizen. We are gratified that our files contain numerous letters from boys throughout America who want to so live that they, upon reaching maturity, can fulfill these obligations and become candidates for positions in this organization. I earnestly hope that the time will come when every local law-enforcement agency in America can arouse the same ambition in the boys of its community.

GROWTH OF CRIMINAL TRACED

Now, let us try to trace the growth of a criminal. True, there are instances where the following conditions do not apply. Their divergence, however, only proves the rule. All too often we find that the 18-, the 19-, the 20-year-old offender has come from a family where selfishness is predominant. It may take the form of incompatibility leading to the divorce of the parents. It may be that parents are concerned only with their own pleasures, leaving the youth to drift as he will. Or it may be that they are poverty-ridden, ignorant people, not realizing their responsibilities. No matter what the foundation may be, it is almost inevitable that the attitude of the parents has a great bearing upon the future of the young criminal. We find that he has mixed with street-corner gangs at an age when his every attention should have been upon the furtherance of his education. We find, for instance, that practically every one of these public rats—"Baby Face" Nelson, John Dillinger, Alvin Karpis, "Pretty Boy" Floyd, and numerous others—started their career of crime when they were little more than children, reared in neglect and poverty. We find them engaged in petty thefts, stealing tires from automobiles, acting as runners and delivery boys for bootleggers, engaging in robberies with older men at such ages as 14, and 15, and 16, a time at which, in the older and more conservative days of America, parents were accustomed to hold serious talks with their boys about their future, instilling into their immature and pliable minds the desire for honorable careers, for achievement, for accomplishment, for a future of honesty and worth-while endeavor. But these boy criminals and thousands upon thousands of others like them were allowed to drift.

Without remonstrance, they were permitted to gather in surroundings and companionships which bore no other possible future than that of outlawry. The saloon, the tavern, the pool hall, the gang at the corner, were places prohibited to the average youth, and infraction of these rules received well-deserved punishment. The sentimental theorists who dominate present-day child guidance, however, believe that if a child is chastised, it may develop an inhibition or affect its later self-expression. So long as we fail to recognize that discipline is an essential part of human development, just so long will we have an aimless, directionless milling of the herd which can result only in mental panic and a thorough disregard for the rights of society to peace and order.

RESURRECT STANDARD OF DISCIPLINE

It is time for America to resurrect that standard of discipline which did much to give this country its rugged, stalwart honesty of purpose, its determination, its achievements. I refer to that parental discipline and guidance which did so much to create law-abiding, successful, and forward-looking citizens. Today, however, that old-fashioned standard has been transformed into the wine card of the cocktail bar; into the sapient belief that an immature mind can be granted utter freedom of action without disastrous results. Its lesson has been supplanted by the dangerous one of the roadside tavern, the parked automobile upon a lonely road, by the constant apathy-engendered desire to have everything which youth wants, inevitably leading to a desire on the part of youth to get what it wants by fair means or foul.

I hope you look upon me as old-fashioned in the enunciation of such beliefs. I much rather would be old-fashioned than to have upon my conscience the knowledge that some boy or some girl is condemned for year after year to live in the fetid atmosphere of a prison cell block, identity destroyed, future forever marred, possibility of good citizenship severely blighted.

MUST CONVINCE YOUTHS WHY CRIME DOES NOT PAY

Therefore, to return to our young criminal, we find that our youth has been handicapped from the beginning—that he had a bad start for which he is not responsible. If we try to tell youth today that crime does not pay, we are confronted with the question of why it does not pay. If we answer that the price of crime is prison, youth answers that it is easy to get probation, a pardon, or a parole. Youth, in spite of all its imagination, is literal. Youth is factual. Youth possesses a certain clarity of vision which often is lost in the more mature mind. One child in a neighborhood, who has learned the fallacy of our all too often maladministered

law enforcement, can become a professor of law evasion for a hundred other neophytes in crime.

Do not for a moment think that youth today knows nothing of the tricks by which it can avoid punishment. You must remember that civilization as it exists today is in direct conflict with the guiding impulses in the days of the cave men. Law as such is an artificial barrier reared by society for the protection of all against individual desires for the gratification of greed. Once we fail to teach reverence for these laws from infancy onward, and the reason for them, then indeed have we a recalcitrant and rebellious being whose very instinct inclines him toward crime.

FROM REFORM SCHOOL TO PENITENTIARY

So what happens when youth, hampered by a lack of parental guidance, indulges in his first infraction? He receives the benefit of that most necessary and most laudatory system, known as probation. It is right that he should have probation. It is a crime for any child upon his first offense to be incarcerated without a chance to reform, always excepting the very rare antisocial degenerate. But under our maladministered system, we find that often the probation officer is ignorant; that he sometimes is himself a criminal; or that he is merely a political panderer willing to debase the most sacred of tasks—that of the protection of our youth—merely to keep a job.

And so in this modern pilgrim's progress toward the inevitable slough of despond, we find our child criminal sunk deeper and deeper, first through poorly administered probation, then into reform schools which are not reform schools but crucibles wherein boil the worst instincts of humanity and where innocence vanishes and insolence takes its place. We find him educated, step by step, not in law obedience but in law avoidance. We find him traveling from the reform school to the reformatory, from the reformatory to the prison with rarely a thought toward his true reformation but always with the association of the vicious, the foul-minded, and the dangerous older criminal. At last he himself becomes a professor of crime, and he, like others, carries on his recruiting in an ever-widening circle which at last has brought us to the degrading position wherein each year in America 12,000 human beings—approximately one-fourth of those killed in battle during the World War—die by murder. Each year, the army of those who suffer from major crimes in the United States equals about one-third of the entire number of enlisted and drafted men who were summoned to protect America in the most crucial hour of our recent history—the World War.

POTENTIAL MURDERS AND VICTIMS

Furthermore, if our army of potential murderers and potential victims of murder were to be gathered into battalions and regiments, they would outnumber the peacetime Army and naval forces of the United States by more than 200,000. If our entire band of criminals who operate constantly throughout the United States and against whom the law-enforcement agents of America are engaged in endless battle were to be assembled in one municipality, it would be almost double the population of Philadelphia (1,950,961).

PRESENT-DAY CRIME PICTURE IN AMERICA

Take that thought with you as you drive along the streets of your home city. Think of what it would mean if block after block, traffic light after traffic light, boulevard after boulevard, office building after office building, residence section stretching into other residence sections and beyond that into suburbs; if all of these should be peopled by robbers, by thieves, by firebugs, rapists, desperadoes, and murderers. That is your present-day crime picture in America. Go further and remember that one-fifth of all of these—in every fifth house—would live some youth who should be looking forward to a life of accomplishment and worth-while purpose, but who is doomed to be nothing but prison fodder.

THE CRIMINAL ROAD TRAVELS DOWNWARD

What is the answer? The only answer can be that this condition constitutes a national crisis calling for a reawakening of our patriotic instincts. It demands that we give of our time; that we give of our energy; that we contribute our best thought and endeavor toward the wiping out of conditions by which such an emergency is created. It means that our children must be taught that adventure lies not along the road of violation but that there are adventures in honest endeavor—greater ones, laudable ones, happy ones.

They must be taught that there is only one road in the world of crime and that road travels downward to the swamps and morasses of suffering. They must be shown the true character of the criminal—that law infraction can lead only to disillusionment, to the weakening, physically and morally, of anyone who follows its teachings. They must be taught that a great career lies before them—more exciting than that of any criminal's life—the career of law enforcement. They must be urged to fight for honesty and the thought be instilled within them that they are crusaders; the volunteers in a new battle for American character and integrity. They must be inculcated with a new political economy—the economy of political honesty.

POLITICS SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO INTERFERE WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT

I would like to say at this point that I am not a critic of our political system. Our country lives by that system. It has prospered by it. In the final analysis our greatest men—Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and all such national figures—were in politics.

However, there is a sharp line of demarcation between the man in politics working always with America uppermost in his thoughts and the politician who thinks only about his job and cares not how he gets it. It is to this latter influence that much of today's crime problem can be traced.

The political hanger-on who wants a job as head of a police department for what he can get out of it, the crooked or ignorant vote getter, the legislator who impedes law enforcement for private or political reasons, the political parasite who for selfish ends wants to be a warden or a probation officer or a policeman or a detective or a guardian of paroled prisoners, is the type to which I refer. They are enemies of America and of every honest man in politics. They are bringing disrepute upon what should be the most laudable career to which any youth of America could aspire. These are the scuttling rats in the ship of politics, gnawing at its timbers, besmirching its ideals, and doing their utmost to wreck our system of government. Against them the many fine and honorable men who, at a personal sacrifice to themselves, have entered political careers are battling almost in vain. Why must this be so?

Do you believe for a moment that the honest men in politics willingly suffer the degradation which these parasites bring upon them? Quite the opposite. Yet time after time they must stand impotent and watch the very persons whom they despise go before the people with all sorts of fantastic and bombastic schemes and be enthusiastically reelected. I need not say that this statement does not refer to any party or any person. It refers to the American habit of enthusiasm for fine promise and failure to demand solid achievement from political self-seekers. You allow crooked people in your county, your city, and your community to come before you, often flaunting their crookedness, and you vote for them because they are shrewd, because they are clever, or because they know how to be good campaigners, and I submit that no elected crook ever willingly appointed an honest man. The same applies for the ignorant, for the mere office grabber, for the hanger-on, for the panderer, and the man who wants a political position only because it is a job.

Politics should not be concerned with jobs. It should be concerned wholly with principles and careers, and until we offer careers, until we have in Government men and women who have built their lives toward the honorable objective of serving their country in public positions, just so long will we have 12,000 murders a year, 1,500,000 major crimes, and an army of malefactors who could march by this building for days on end without once the end being sighted.

REAL MEN VERSUS DESPERATE CRIMINALS

In this connection I desire to draw a contrast—that of the achievements of boys' clubs under intelligent private direction and the lack of reformation accomplished by the average State institution. One turns out men; the other turns out more desperate criminals. Why is this so? The private institution often works with limited funds and against many obstacles; the State or community institution has heavy appropriations, full-time employees, large buildings, and expansive grounds, yet it can do little more than send forth graduates of crime, who are bound, in many instances, for that larger college known as the penitentiary. The answer is that private institutions are built with a desire for rehabilitation and accomplishment.

The community institution has fallen into the grasping hands of the renegades of our political system, too often diverted to personal ends. That's the word for which I have been seeking—the renegade—the traitor, the vile enemy in our political family which seeks to disrupt our institutions of government; who knives from within; who has only selfish purposes; who is the antagonist of everything that is honorable in our present-day form of government. As such, he is a friend of crime and a barrier to law enforcement. In his constant undermining of the finer ideals of our political system he crawls into our court rooms; he assembles the crooked doctors to change the faces of our outlaws; he telephones the crooked lawyer to be on hand not only for the protection of the criminal but for the planning of the crime; he contacts the crooked aviator, the crooked shopkeeper, the crooked hotel and hideout owner, the criminal gunsmith, and every other member of that undercover army, the support by which crime lives, thrives, and plunders. He sneaks into our reformatories, into our probation system, into our prisons, always with one foul purpose—the realization of personal gain at the expense of the commonwealth. He encourages suspended sentences. He is in the lobby rooms of legislatures to fight against the passage of proper laws for the hampering of criminal activities. He is the whining pleader before the elected judge, who, all too often, must answer to his command that the proper process of law be set aside and a criminal walk free from the court room. This is the man whom every high-minded person in politics abhors. This is the man whom it is our duty as American citizens to eradicate from our political picture, so that the honest man who so often thanklessly strives in your behalf and under the cloud of ignominy may be given a free hand and encouragement in the battle for the sanctity of our political system.

CONSTANT CAMPAIGN AGAINST CRIME

Therefore your campaign as the friend of the boy and girl in crime must be a constant one. We must carry education into the home. We must follow it into the school. A knowledge of the ill effects of crime and the benefits of crime prevention should be required of every school teacher in America. What is the sense of spending hours in teaching our youth the history of America, when many of those boys and girls are doomed to recall that history while sitting in a dank prison cell? Teachers should spend more time

building the future of America, a future which can be made as clean, as high-minded, and as progressive as we, the people, desire it. We need a new viewpoint—not one of sentimentality, but of wise adjudication and administration. We need to know that the problem of crime is the problem of the family, and we need above all things to incessantly instill in the pliable mind of youth the unalterable fact that, seek as it will, try and twist and squirm though it may to beat society at the game of crime, it cannot win. To that end we must have adequate avenues of detection, swift apprehension, and certain punishment. This does not mean that law-enforcement officers are eager to reap a harvest of arrests and prison sentences. Instead the honest law-enforcement agencies of America are eager to see the day when anyone, youth or adult, faced with the temptation of crime, will be bolstered in his fight against it by the knowledge that if he commits this crime he will be punished. There is no country in the world which has the proper law enforcement that also has a real crime problem—the two cannot exist.

PAROLE PROBLEM

We must strike on all fronts, and particularly at the one which today is doing, perhaps, more than any other factor to undermine our national respect for law. I refer to that filth-encrusted scandal, the parole problem. I am not an opponent but an advocate of the wise, intelligent administration of the highly laudable theory of parole. However, I do object, and object most strenuously, to the administration of that system as it is administered in some of our States. Practically every special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who has died on the field of battle against criminals has been sent to his death by a gun in the hands of a paroled convict. I object to the fact that of the 13,010 most desperate, vicious enemies of society listed in the identification files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation 3,734 of them have been touched by the magic wand of parole or pardon clemency. I equally protest against the fact that even the most honest advocates of the parole system have adopted an ostrichlike attitude in attempting to cover up atrocious defects.

Time after time we hear these men, to whom I give all credit for sincerity and honesty of purpose, insist that only a certain percent of parolees fail to live up to their promises. This is the group which brings about our secondary crimes. This is the group which heads our desperate gangs, which commits our kidnappings, our train robberies, our bank hold-ups, and our murders. These are postgraduates of outlawry and professors of crime. These are the select minority which the parole champions dispose of so glibly. These are the men who, like a prisoner in Florida, committed two murders, received clemency for each, then committed a double murder to show how much he was reformed. Or like the man in Montana, who, when paroled, kidnapped the daughter of his benefactor and carried her away to become a white-slave victim in a mountain cabin. Or the man in a Middle Western penitentiary who committed four murders, who was paroled four times, and then graduated into kidnapping. This group contains the John Dillingers, the "Baby Face" Nelsons, the "Pretty Boy" Floyds, and the Alvin Karpises and Barker boys, each of whom piled murder upon murder until he became a national menace.

Against this condition I protest with all the strength in my being, and I say that our penal system cannot come from behind the cloud of disgrace until the sentimentalists and convict-indulging theorists recognize the fact that every time they allow such men to go free upon the streets they are building an example to the youth of America that you can get away with crime; that you can beat our system of law enforcement. I appeal to you as representative citizens of America to fight this problem into the open and to insist that this dangerous policy be sweepingly and constructively changed.

WONDERFUL WORK OF BOYS' CLUBS

To those who loyally and enthusiastically support the boys' clubs of America may I address a few words of admiration and sincere appreciation for the wonderful work which they are accomplishing. The upbuilding of the morale of the youth of our country through these organizations is of inestimable value, not only to those directly benefiting by the operations of the boys' clubs but to each and every individual who loves his country and who is interested in its development and progress. The character and personality development which the boys' clubs of America accomplish will return manifold gold dividends throughout the generations to come. I know of no greater work; I know of no better work; I know of no work better entitled to receive the enthusiastic support of every man and woman interested in law enforcement and our country's institutions.

DEVELOPMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12120) to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 12120, with Mr. ROBERTSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am rather surprised that my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEEN] has taken the floor today and more or less repudiated the pending bill.

In connection with this matter I may say there were three votes taken in the committee. One vote was to appropriate or authorize \$4,000,000, another to authorize \$8,000,000, and the final vote was on the authorization of \$6,000,000. There was no opposition to the bill, as the report shows. There has been no minority report filed.

Following the committee report, the gentleman from Georgia again introduced his bill in accordance with the report of the committee, which is H. R. 12120, now being considered by the House. The gentleman from Georgia then wrote the report of the committee, which speaks for itself.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I am sure the gentleman wishes to cast no unfavorable reflection upon my colleague, the author of this bill. The gentleman has expressed surprise at the attitude taken by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEEN] in the consideration of the rule. May I ask the gentleman if he does not remember that the difference which has developed here today between the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO], chairman of the committee, and the author of the bill, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEEN] was brought out before the Rules Committee when a rule was requested?

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes.

Mr. COX. Therefore, the gentleman has known since that time at least or all along what the attitude of the gentleman from Georgia was.

Mr. PALMISANO. Not all along. From that time on. I may say that if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEEN] entertained those views at that time he should have so stated to the committee and not appeared before the Rules Committee and conveyed to the Rules Committee an impression to which that committee was unanimously opposed.

I may say further that in my absence I designated the gentleman from Georgia to call the committee together so that a resolution could be prepared for presentation to the Rules Committee. The Members of the House will readily appreciate that if I knew the attitude of the gentleman from Georgia was contrary to what had been agreed to in the committee I certainly would not have permitted him to call the committee together and give him full sway.

Mr. DEEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DEEN. May I ask the gentleman if he is not aware of the fact that in committee and during the hearings I contended all the way through, as the hearings will show, for my original bill which called for an appropriation of \$12,000,000?

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman was not in agreement with the committee, he should have refused to sign the committee report, and he should have presented a minority report to the Members of the House stating that he was opposed to the action of the full committee, even though it opposed his own bill. He should have asked for a substitution of bills. I say when the members of the committee agree and there is not filed a minority report, the Members of the House should stand by the committee or else abolish all of the committees.

When we speak of the Senate bill, we should bear in mind that with all due respect to the Senate they held absolutely no hearings on the measure.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. In just a minute. I understand they held no hearings, while we held hearings for 3 days. We then considered the bill and did the best we possibly could under the circumstances, and the members of the committee knowing my views on the legislation came to me and said, "We understand your views, but notwithstanding your views on the legislation, you have been fair and honorable and have given a hearing to every member of the committee."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. Pardon me, let me finish my statement.

Let me now call your attention to another provision they are adding to the bill with respect to vocational teachers, if you please. They have introduced in the Senate bill a provision whereby they are going to educate the mayors and councilmen and the public officials of the various municipalities, and I say to you that if you adopt this provision of the Senate bill it is the duty of those same gentlemen to come here and teach the Members of the Congress what to do, because they are now going out and asking us to be permitted to teach men who have been elected by the people of their own towns and cities and, if you please, teach their own superior officers, because after all is said and done, if they are going to teach the mayor of New York City or the mayor of Baltimore or Cleveland, why not give them the same right to teach their own Governor, whom they happen to be subordinate to?

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. Let me first finish this statement.

Let me refer to some of the testimony we heard, referring to Mr. Baumes, whose testimony appears at page 40 of the hearings. He is a gentleman from Virginia and happens to be one of the teachers in public service, and I am asking him a question:

The CHAIRMAN. If the heads of the various departments have had some technical education, should they not be able to instruct their men? Take, as an example, this head of the department of weights and measures that you mentioned; if he is well qualified, would he not be able to instruct his men accordingly?

Mr. BAUMES. You would think so, but we have found that that usually is not true, for several reasons.

Here is a man technically educated to conduct this particular business and here comes along an ordinary teacher who is going to tell him what to do.

Then at page 41, near the bottom of the page, the following occurred:

The CHAIRMAN. Then the teacher would get instructions from the head of the department and then, in turn—

Bear this in mind—

The teacher would educate.

Mr. BAUMES. Yes, sir; you are exactly right.

Is this Congress going to say to a man who is advocating vocational training that we are going to permit them to educate or instruct the mayors and the officials of the municipal governments throughout the State, and they, in turn, go to a particular man to get instruction and then in turn instruct the municipal agents? I say, Mr. Chairman, we are going too far on this proposition, and this is what will happen if we put in the provisions of the Senate bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 more minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman tell us where that provision is in the Senate bill?

Mr. PALMISANO. Page 3, line 15, which states—
including public and other service occupations in such States and Territories.

The gentleman who spoke on this subject and whom I have just quoted is going to obtain his knowledge from the municipal employees, and then, in turn, he would convey it to others. I say, Mr. Chairman, we cannot accept a proposition of this kind.

I may say that on page 4 of the report filed by my colleague the gentleman from Georgia, at the top of the page, it is stated:

S. 2883 also contained the provision that training in public and other service occupations should be included in the amount allotted to trade and industrial subjects. The committee did not accept this provision.

This is the provision referred to by the gentleman whom I quoted from the hearings. I may say that I have not the time now to go over the hearings, but there is another provision here referred to by Mr. Baumes, where Mr. Baumes goes on to say that in Virginia they have been instructing the mayors and the city councilmen, who are elected by the people, and if this principle applies, why not let them instruct us? I think it would be proper and then they could

instruct the Governor of a State, who, in turn, would be their superior officer. I submit we are going far afield on this whole proposition.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield.

Mr. COX. The gentleman quoted from the bill and made some reference to something in the Senate bill that the House bill did not carry. I presume the gentleman referred to section 3 of the House bill.

Mr. PALMISANO. I am referring to the Senate bill, page 3, line 15, which includes a public-service corporation.

Mr. DONDERO. That is line 6, page 3.

Mr. COX. That is substantially the same as section 1 in the House bill. In other words, are not the two bills, the House bill and the Senate bill, substantially the same, except as to the amount of money to be allocated to the States, and so forth?

Mr. PALMISANO. No; that is not true. In the House bill we eliminate the public service and in the House bill we include section 6, which is not contained in the Senate bill.

There has been a lot of talk and criticism that the money has been used by boys for private gain. In order to prevent that we added section 6, which says:

Sec. 6. No part of the appropriations herein authorized shall be expended in industrial-plant training programs, except such industrial-plant training be bona-fide vocational training, and not a device to utilize the services of vocational trainees for private profit.

That provision is not in the Senate bill.

Mr. COX. That is correct. Section 6 of the Senate bill is substantially the same as section 5 of the House bill.

Mr. PALMISANO. The Senate bill, with the exception of the amount, is identically the same as the House bill, except section 6 of the House bill eliminates the public-service occupation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORITZ].

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I want to say a few words in relation to this bill. In the first place, I was one of the Members who voted for the \$12,000,000. We lost that vote, but we compromised on \$6,000,000. Now, in all frankness and fairness, inasmuch as we agreed to that, why should you try to substitute the Senate bill?

Subsequently it was brought to the attention of the committee that this appropriation was very important, because we found out that of all the money expended for relief, for getting the best returns, this money expended for vocational education gave us the best returns.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORITZ. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. The gentleman says there was a compromise from \$12,000,000 to \$6,000,000. Does not the gentleman think that \$12,000,000 would be more proper?

Mr. MORITZ. Yes; but we agreed on \$6,000,000, and we ought to keep our agreement, because if we had not agreed to \$6,000,000 we would not have gotten any bill.

Mr. DEEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORITZ. I yield.

Mr. DEEN. The gentleman knows that I did not vote for the \$12,000,000?

Mr. MORITZ. The gentleman knows that I voted for it, and we lost, and we voted for the compromise of \$6,000,000.

Mr. DEEN. The gentleman knows that he voted for the \$6,000,000.

Mr. MORITZ. Yes.

Mr. DEEN. And he knows that I did not vote for the \$6,000,000?

Mr. MORITZ. I do not know about that.

Mr. DEEN. Well, I know it.

Mr. MORITZ. But, at any rate, of the money spent for relief, this has been the best investment we have, because it helps people to help themselves. We found out in States like Oklahoma and Texas that they are being taught how to provide and prepare food. When the Government ordered the cattle to be slaughtered, they were taught to can this meat,

and in that way they saved themselves from starvation. Furthermore, this activity in the school helps the youth of our country do something worth while, as against loafing around in a poolroom and idling their time away, and maybe getting into mischief, as often happens.

Mr. TERRY. And if the gentleman were not on the committee, then he would vote for the \$12,000,000?

Mr. MORITZ. I believe I would; yes. I yield back the rest of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable said here today about the difference between the Senate bill and the House bill. The Senate bill provides for permanent legislation authorizing \$12,000,000 annually. The House bill provides for \$6,000,000 each year for 3 years. The Senate bill provides for a matching by the States up to 50 percent, until 1942, and then graduates that percentage up until it is 100 percent. The House bill provides the same as the Smith-Hughes bill, 100-percent matching by the States, or, dollar for dollar. The statement has been made on the floor this afternoon to the effect that the States contributed \$3 for every dollar contributed by the Federal Government. I have here a letter dated March 14, 1936, signed by Mr. Wright, from the Bureau of Education, directed to me, in which he says that—

To match this expenditure, which was \$4,000,000 last year, from Federal money, as required by the basic Vocational Education Act, the States and Territories expended for the same purpose in this year ended June 30, 1935, the sum of \$5,149,000, or \$1.39 of State and local money for each dollar of Federal money expended.

I quote that simply to show that the States have matched dollar for dollar under the Smith-Hughes Act.

There is one provision in the Senate bill which goes so far that if adopted we will have men receiving their money from the Federal Treasury who have been taught how to sell gasoline, selling gasoline to you at the gas stations; you will have men in grocery stores and meat shops who have been taught by Federal money how to sell goods and merchandise over the counter. I believe it is more essential to place the buying power in the hands of the people to buy those commodities rather than to take Federal money to teach people how to sell them to the people who have no money with which to buy them. That is a vicious provision in the Senate bill which ought to be taken out, if the House adopts the Senate bill.

Mr. DEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. DEEN. Let me ask the gentleman this question: He spoke about teachers teaching people how to sell meat and other products. Is it not a fact that when we came to Congress the Parliamentarian took mercy on us, and with the Federal salary that he receives, taught us some parliamentary law?

Mr. DONDERO. How far would my good friend from Georgia go? Would he use Federal money for the teaching of every human activity known to mankind?

Mr. DEEN. No; but I do not think it is fair to discriminate simply because a person works in a meat shop or in a 10-cent store. They ought to have the same opportunity as that given to other people in farm, factory, or school.

Mr. DONDERO. Does not the gentleman think they ought to be instructed by the people who employ them, rather than get money out of the Federal Treasury to teach them? Let me read one sentence from the testimony of Mr. Baumes, of Virginia, appearing at the bottom of page 40 of the hearings. He said:

This thing is happening: That as we closed our last fire school in Richmond last summer the head of the bureau of weights and measures said to me, "You have just done something for the firemen of the State. Why can't you do it for the weights-and-measures men?"

The Senate bill would go so far as even to teach the weights-and-measures men of the various States, counties, cities, and towns of the United States how to weigh and how to test the scales—all to come out of the Federal Treas-

ury. Why should not that be a part of the work of the States and not of the Federal Government?

Mr. COX. If the Senate amendment should be offered as a substitute for the House bill, the gentleman would then have an opportunity to offer an amendment to the amendment, that is, to the Senate bill offered as an amendment, to strike out the language in section 1 of the Senate bill which would authorize the objectionable activity to which the gentleman refers. I do not know that there would be any serious objection to that amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Would the gentleman be willing to vote for that kind of an amendment to strike it out?

Mr. COX. Yes; I think I would.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I want to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the appropriation made under the present act is not the only assistance that the Federal Government is giving for the purpose of vocational education. The Smith-Hughes Act, which is a continuing act and goes on from year to year, provides \$7,382,000. In addition to that, there has been provided for the last 2 or 3 years under the George-Elzey Act \$3,184,000. The act that we are considering today has been referred to as the \$6,000,000 per annum act. It actually provides \$7,302,000 per annum, instead of \$6,000,000. That \$6,000,000 is the largest single item and is for one specific purpose.

I have always voted for vocational education bills. I have spoken for them here at various times before the membership of this House. I am just as strongly for vocational education today as I ever have been, and I am for this House bill. I regret that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, my good friend for whom I have the highest regard and kindly personal feeling, has seen fit to desert the committee. I feel it my duty to stand by the committee. He was designated by this committee to report this bill. Here is the recommendation:

Report favorably, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. DEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. In just a moment. I decline to yield at this time. I will yield to the gentleman later.

That is his statement. That is not my statement. For reasons that are amply sufficient to himself, I know not why, but all of a sudden he says, "Well, let us take the Senate. It has \$12,000,000 in it. Let us take the Senate bill."

Now, I do not desire to be parsimonious about educational matters, but I do desire to stand for a bill that I think may be finally enacted into law.

The increase provided for in the present bill, which I am compelled to refer to as the Deen bill, although the gentleman from Georgia at the present time is disavowing it, over the George-Elzey bill, and it is replacing the George-Elzey bill, is \$4,117,397 per annum. There has been talk that the vocational educational work ought to be extended and expanded. I say to you that I am for a program of that kind, but I do believe, when we are providing over \$4,000,000 per annum for additional expansion work, that we are providing quite a generous sum. As those who have charge of this work extend it and if it is the desire of this House to extend it further in years to come, we can give them additional amounts.

I yield now to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DEEN. The gentleman knows that this bill is only an authorization and that they can come back every year and get an appropriation. We are not paying them this money for the next 50 years. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. CARTER. I know that this is an authorization bill limited to 3 years, and that the sums authorized under this bill will be appropriated each and every year.

Mr. DEEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CARTER. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. DEEN. The gentleman read the introduction to the report, "The Committee on Education, to whom was referred the bill", and so forth, "to provide for vocational education—

the committee having had the same under consideration report favorably with the recommendation that the bill do pass with the following amendments." The gentleman knows that the word "unanimous" is not in the report. Does not the gentleman know further that while I contended in the committee at every meeting, both at executive sessions and in the open hearings, for the \$12,000,000, the gentleman from California fought it and bitterly opposed it all the way through?

Mr. CARTER. No. I did not oppose the \$12,000,000 bitterly. I opposed it because I did not believe the President of the United States would sign a bill providing for that sum.

I think if we do want to increase this we ought to go at it in a sensible way. While we could make a reasonable increase, and have made a reasonable increase, I do not want to increase the amount to an extent that it would endanger the passage of the bill.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. What is the amount we are appropriating now for this same work?

Mr. CARTER. At the present time the Federal Government for this work is appropriating \$10,701,603 per annum. That is, under all bills. That is for the United States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CARTER. In just a moment. I may say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] that that amount would be increased by something over \$4,000,000 if the present House bill is enacted into law.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman mean that it would make it over \$14,000,000?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. BIERMANN. I wonder if I am correct in my understanding of these facts. The George-Ellzey Act, which this bill is displacing, during the present year supplies \$3,184,000?

Mr. CARTER. Three million, one hundred and eighty-four thousand dollars; yes.

Mr. BIERMANN. And the House, after quite a little hearing, more than doubled the amount.

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. BIERMANN. The Senate, without any hearing, seeks to quadruple it. Is that right?

Mr. CARTER. That is just about the situation. Without yielding further, I would like to say that I have endeavored to find out on what the Senate based its estimate of \$12,000,000. There is not, so far as I can find, one sentence of a hearing anywhere to show why they increased the amount. One of the representatives of the Bureau of Education, Mr. Wright, appeared before the House committee and said in substance that he could not tell us anything because he did not have permission of the Bureau of the Budget, or somebody, to talk; and he never said one word about the Bureau of Education needing any additional amount.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished colleague yield for a question?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. SIROVICH. As I understand the situation at the present time, the House bill provides that the States must match the money contributed by the Federal Government. Is that right?

Mr. CARTER. That is right.

Mr. SIROVICH. The Senate bill, on the other hand, does not make it mandatory for every State to match equally money contributed by the Federal Government because many of our Southern States are in a very frightful economic condition and cannot match funds. The Senate bill, therefore,

would help these States in the emergency with which they are confronted at the present time. Am I correct?

Mr. CARTER. No. I think the gentleman is inferring that it treats some of the States in one manner and other States in another manner. This is not true. The Senate bill does not require 100-percent matching, but it does treat all States alike on a sliding-scale basis, the States matching I think at first 50 percent of what the Federal Government provides with gradual increases year by year until a full matching is reached. As I understand the Senate bill it applies equally to all the States and not just to certain States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If I understood the statement made by members of the committee this afternoon correctly, taking the situation in the State of Arkansas as an illustration, which would be typical of the situation in other States, there are now pending over 200 applications from schools in that State which cannot be acted on favorably unless this additional appropriation is made.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yielded for a question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. My question is: How many schools are there in the United States in a similar condition?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am trying to determine the extent of the need for this additional money. If that situation is true in Arkansas certainly it is true in other States.

Mr. CARTER. There is, no doubt, need in many of the States for additional work, and we are providing something over \$4,000,000 for the next year for an expansion of the work.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman mentioned the President of the United States and wondered what he would do in the event the bill passed. Permit me to read an excerpt from a letter addressed by the President to the New York State Conference of Mayors.

Mr. CARTER. I do not yield for that letter. I do not know what it is about.

Mr. BEITER. I wish to read from it an excerpt giving the President's views on legislation of this kind.

Mr. CARTER. If the letter relates to this bill, I would like to hear it. If it does not relate to this bill, I cannot yield for the gentleman to read it.

Mr. BEITER. It relates to legislation of this type.

Mr. CARTER. I decline to yield at the present time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe any Member of the House is more deeply interested in the subject of vocational education than I am. I know it is not a popular thing to oppose the largest amount that may be suggested for a cause of this kind.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of certain provisions of the Senate bill, but I think the gentlemen who have presented their case to the Committee of the Whole for the bill reported by the House committee have made the best argument for the House figure; and, so far as I am concerned, although I would like to see as much money as possible appropriated for this cause, it is my purpose to support the House figure of \$6,000,000, although if the Senate figures are adopted, I shall not vote against the bill on that account. After all, when you double the amount which has been heretofore appropriated for a particular purpose at one stroke in a time of depression like this when we are having as much difficulty as we are in making Government expenditures and income meet, my colleagues, you have gone a long way, and the people of this country interested in vocational education ought to be satisfied.

I shall now address my remarks to a feature of the bill in which I am very much interested. The House committee apparently determined first that it ought to have a provision in the bill providing that 50 percent of the amount of the annual appropriation need not be matched by the States. I gather this from the fact that they originally considered the first bill introduced by Mr. DEEN. After considering it the committee worked out a draft of the bill which they had reintroduced, and in the reintroduced draft they included on the first page a proviso to the effect that 50 percent of the amount of the appropriation need not be matched. This was evidently based upon the idea that they were adding \$3,000,000 to the \$3,000,000 which had theretofore been authorized, and that since the States had apparently experienced great difficulty in matching the \$3,000,000 which was already available, they might not be able to match the additional \$3,000,000, and for the 3 years to be covered by the terms of this bill the States should be relieved of matching the additional \$3,000,000.

I felt that that provision was exceedingly wise, and I regret very much that the committee had recommended to the House that it be stricken from the bill by amendment, but, after all, it is a matter to be determined by the House as to whether it will accede to the judgment of the committee or not.

I have a particular reason for feeling that especially in times like these the matching requirement ought not to be made for a very liberal part of this appropriation. I notice in my own State, with regard to vocational agricultural instruction that the schools located in the districts which have the least property values and the least taxable resources get no help. The school districts are required, as you know, or at least they are in my State, to pay a part of the money required to match the Federal funds; therefore the school districts which have ample property values and ample taxable resources are able to put up the necessary money to help match the Federal funds and their boys receive education in vocational agriculture, while in the poorer sections where they are not able to raise by taxation the necessary money to match the Federal money, but where they need this aid fully as much if not more than in the other sections to which I have referred, they get no assistance whatever. It appears that it is like the part of the Scriptures which says: "To him that hath shall be given."

Mr. SIROVICH. How can we overcome this?

Mr. TARVER. We can overcome it by defeating the committee amendment which proposes to strike out the proviso requiring that 50 percent of this money shall be allocated without being matched by the States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, we know that there are a great many unemployed in this country, and we are very much concerned with the matter of appropriating sufficient money to take care of the unemployed. But what about the children of the unemployed? These children cannot follow the footsteps of the father. They must be trained in vocational education. They must be fitted to follow a useful pursuit and qualify themselves to do useful things. Many school districts cannot provide this education unless assisted by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, let me quote the following from a letter which I have just received from the State director of vocational education in the State of Idaho, William Kerr:

We sadly need the funds provided for under Senate bill 2883 so that we could reach a large number of out-of-school farm youth with Federal funds that do not require matching by local funds. School districts are glad and anxious to match these funds for farm boys attending high schools. The older boy who has finished high school or dropped out of school is even in better position to make use of vocational training, but local districts are not financially able just now to help in reaching this group.

Mr. Chairman, the provision in the Senate bill which we propose to substitute for the House bill that—

One-half of the annual allotments for each field of work except teacher training would not have to be matched for a period of 6

years. There would be a gradual increase in State and local matching after that until 1948, when all the money would have to be matched—

will be of great assistance and vitally necessary to extract the benefits that are proposed by this legislative body to help fit the growth of my State to meet the responsibility of useful citizenship. The farm organizations of Idaho are particularly interested in this legislation and are giving close attention to the deliberations of Congress in considering this measure as evinced by a number of communications received. For the information of the Members, I shall read a letter from the Kimberly Grange:

KIMBERLY, IDAHO, April 30, 1936.

Congressman COMPTON I. WHITE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: We, the members of Kimberly Grange, No. 230, Kimberly, Idaho, most heartily endorse Senate bill 2883 and would ask that you use your influence to further this measure.

We feel that the permanent authorization of additional funds will be of great assistance to enlarge and increase the program for the out-of-school group.

There are a number of young people in this community, ranging in ages from 18 to 25 years, who are not being reached by the limited funds now available who would be benefited immensely by the passage of Senate bill 2883.

Thanking you, we are,

KIMBERLY GRANGE, No. 230, KIMBERLY, IDAHO,
C. ROY HAVERLAND, Secretary.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER].

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California refused to yield to me so that I could make the President's position clear in connection with legislation of this type. May I read an excerpt from a letter signed by the President, as follows:

It has indeed been gratifying to note the splendid progress made by the State of New York in the training of municipal officials, particularly the police and firemen. There can be no doubt that training produces efficiency and I am glad that the division of State police has been able to cooperate closely with your organization in the promotion of this splendid educational movement.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. Chairman, the demand for vocational education in the State of New York at the present time is far above the financial ability of the State of New York and the various communities within the State, and without the assistance of funds which may be made available by the passage of this bill the situation will constitute a serious emergency.

I have letters and telegrams in my files from principals of the Girls Vocational High School, the Seneca Vocational High School, the McKinley Vocational High School, the Peckham Vocational High School, the Technical High School, the Burgard Vocational High School, all of Buffalo, N. Y., and the supervisor of vocational education, city of Buffalo, and treasurer, New York State Vocational Association, all endorsing Senate bill 2883 and recommending that the House bill be amended in accordance with the Senate bill, or that the Senate bill be substituted for H. R. 12120 in the House.

The demand for vocational education service in the State of New York at the present time is so far above the financial ability of the State of New York and various communities within the State that without the assistance of funds that could be made available by the passage of this bill the situation will constitute nothing less than a serious emergency. Out of 6,217 pupils graduating from the public elementary schools this June in Buffalo, N. Y., 2,259 have declared their intention to enter vocational high schools. This does not include a proportionate expected demand from the parochial school system. It is impossible to provide the training they request under present conditions.

Buffalo is in great need of all the possible funds to come from the Senate bill. A tremendous increase in enrollment in the vocational schools is indicated and seriously curtailed educational budgets make increased Federal assistance absolutely necessary.

The Senate bill is endorsed by the Conference of Mayors and Other Municipal Officials of the State of New York and 5,000 cities, villages, and towns, represented in the American

Municipal Association, the National Federation of Thirty-six State Leagues of Municipalities, have gone on record favoring the measure. It is also supported by the American Vocational Association and leading educators and municipal officials throughout the country. The Municipal Training Institute of New York and the New York State Association of Towns have gone on record favoring the adoption of the Senate bill, which passed the upper House without a dissenting vote.

Cities, villages, and towns of the United States, acting through their State leagues of municipalities, have since 1928 operated training schools for more than 50,000 officials in the service of these municipalities. These schools, which constitute vocational education in the field of public employment, have become indispensable to the efficient administration of municipal affairs. One authority has said tranchantly that "they have put the breath of life into the dry bones of civil service."

The cities and first- and second-class villages of New York State, acting through their official association, the New York State Conference of Mayors and Other Municipal Officials, have since 1928 operated training schools for more than 33,000 municipal officials. The schools have won the unanimous endorsement and support of all mayors and other municipal officials in the State. The board of regents of the University of State of New York has recognized the standing and significance of the schools by creating an educational corporation of municipal officials to operate them. Many officials and authorities consider them to be one of the most hopeful signs for permanent improvement in future municipal government.

A bill by Senator GEORGE, S. 2883, makes available to the several States, funds for the further development of vocational education. The bill provides that a portion of such funds may be expended for the vocational training of those in public and other service occupations. If enacted into law, this bill will enable municipalities of the Nation, after appropriate Federal and State action, and through State departments of education, to share in such funds for the operation, by their official organizations, of in-service training schools for municipal officials. It should be emphasized that this training is now being accomplished at a very modest cost, and that any Federal funds utilized would be small in amount. The exact nature of the demand which might be expected can best be illustrated by citing the cost of the training program of the New York State Conference of Mayors, which has averaged annually about seventy-five hundred dollars. There is absolutely no need for the expenditure of large sums of money in such training work, because it can be done through the cooperative use of existing training facilities and resources in all levels of government.

S. 2883 has been favorably and unanimously by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. However, the companion bill, H. R. 12120, by Congressman DEEN, has been reported by the House Education Committee with the elimination of provisions for the training of those in public and other service occupations. The municipalities of the country desire strongly that S. 2883, by Senator GEORGE, be passed rather than H. R. 12120, by Congressman DEEN. However, if a compromise is absolutely necessary as between the two bills, it is the desire of the municipalities of the country to retain in the bill, which is finally agreed upon, the phrase "including public and other service occupations", as this appears on page 3, line 15, of S. 2883, as reported by the Senate Committee (Calendar 1590). If H. R. 12120 is to be amended from the floor of the House, it is the earnest hope of the municipalities that a similar provision be inserted in the amended House bill.

S. 2883 is endorsed by the 5,000 cities, villages, and towns represented in the American Municipal Association, the national federation of 36 State leagues of municipalities. It is also supported by the American Vocational Association and leading educators and municipal officials throughout the country. In New York State the measure is favored by the Mayors' Conference, the Municipal Training Institute of New

York State, the New York State Association of Towns, and educational authorities.

Perhaps the most striking endorsement of S. 2883 is found in recent action by the Governor, legislature, and educational authorities of the State of New York. By chapter 225 of the laws of 1936 of the State of New York, Governor Lehman, the legislature, and the board of regents of the University of the State of New York, have paved the way for the use of Federal vocational-education funds for the training of local-government officials. This statute enables cities and villages of the State, through the State Department of Education, to share in any Federal funds made available for the training of public officials by the Congress of the United States. It is the first State statute of its kind in the country.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, it is my sincere belief that all Members of the Senate and the House who have carefully studied the provisions of this bill providing funds for vocational education are unanimous in the conviction that no money allocated by the Federal Government for any purpose is more certain to pay big dividends than is the money we are authorizing to be expended for vocational education.

Anyone who has had opportunity to judge the financial, social, economic, and intellectual results of vocational education, under the encouragement of the Federal Government, cannot fail to realize that no other type of education is more appreciated by the American people.

THE YOUNG PEOPLE ARE WATCHING US FROM THE GALLERIES

Today, as we are assembled here in the Halls of Congress, we have seen looking down upon us from the overcrowded galleries young men and women who have journeyed to the Nation's Capital from all parts of the country.

Many of these young people who are here on sightseeing tours under the guidance of their teachers have graduated from schools this year and are being sent out into the world to earn a living with a type of education for which, I regret to say, in too many cases, there is very little or no market.

BABSON ADVISES INVESTMENT IN SELF-IMPROVEMENT THAT ASSURES SELF-ADVANCEMENT

To succeed in life or in business in these modern times it is necessary to equip yourself with ideas and training which you can exchange for success.

To make money, under present conditions, you must equip yourself with ideas and training worth money.

Babson, the famous financial expert and investment counsellor, is right when he says, "The best investment is investment in yourself—in self-improvement that will assure you self-advancement."

Much of the high-school, college, and university education fails to equip young people with ideas which they can exchange for success, money, happiness, or anything else worth while.

Education that cannot be marketed, education the world does not need and does not want, is not of much value to the person who possesses it.

Education that leaves you where you are costs too much even if you get it for nothing.

The type of education for which we are now providing will equip thousands of students with ideas, training, knowledge they can exchange for greater success, increased earnings, and greater opportunity.

A LIFETIME INVESTMENT THAT PAYS BIG DIVIDENDS

A while ago this Congress authorized the building of two battleships at a cost of \$104,000,000.

The amount of money authorized in this bill for the education of our citizens is only about \$12,000,000.

A bomb, dropped from an airplane flying the skies or shot from a submarine plowing the seas, would wreck the two battleships costing one hundred and four million, and send them to the bottom of the sea. But the education purchased by hundreds of thousands of our young citizens at an investment of only twelve million, authorized in this measure, can-

not be destroyed. It will last throughout an entire lifetime and will draw interest and pay big cash dividends from the start.

THREEFOLD FUNCTION OF THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE IN THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

Mr. Chairman, one of the functions of the Congressional Committee on Education, of which I have the privilege to be a member, is to assist in determining the responsibility of the United States Government to education insofar as Federal legislation is concerned.

Another function of our Education Committee of the United States Congress is to secure and interpret the new research findings relating to changing conditions in education throughout the Nation and to be guided by these facts in preparing legislative measures in the interest of education.

A third duty of the House and Senate Committee on Education is to formulate a practical, businesslike policy of Federal cooperation with the State for the purpose of meeting such serious emergencies as this one which now threatens the educational advantages of unprepared and unadjusted millions of people.

The threefold function of our Education Committee which I have just explained has never been exercised in behalf of any legislation for which there is greater need than there is for this legislation which our committee reports to the House today.

WITHOUT EDUCATION DEMOCRACY IS IMPOSSIBLE

Any recovery program, spending thousands of millions of dollars to open factory doors but leaving schoolhouse doors closed would likely be discredited by the parents of the Nation, who have the responsibility of training and educating the children who are to be the citizens of tomorrow.

We have every assurance of those in official position to speak with authority that under the New Deal of the Roosevelt administration education is assured a square deal.

PARENTS GOING BACK TO SCHOOL

It is a concern of legislators, as well as the concern of educators, that parents are going back to school today. Never before has there been such a demand for adult education, and this is a fact in which both State and National Governments have deep interest. This bill provides for new educational training for the parents as well as for the children.

All agree that the safety and perpetuity of democracy depends in a large degree upon the education of the citizenry, and that means the education of both the young and the old.

No nation can rise above the level of what its citizens think, and its citizens cannot think above the level of what they know.

When our citizens stop learning, our Nation will start dying.

ALL CONGRESSMEN AND SENATORS LEGISLATING FOR THE PEOPLE SHOULD BE EDUCATORS OF THE PEOPLE

Believing that legislators for the people should also be educators of the people in such subjects as economics, social and political science, and the processes of government, I have conducted a large number of educational forums throughout the United States in an effort to help unadjusted men and women make the most of themselves and get ahead in life.

This experience has given me an opportunity to study the results of vocational education of the type we are providing in this bill.

So great has been the response to these business, educational, and self-advancement forums which I have had the pleasure personally to conduct, under auspices of the Peoples' Traveling University Service, that in most cities large numbers of people were turned away, night after night, unable to find standing room in the packed auditoriums.

POPULARITY OF ADULT EDUCATION

Nowhere has there been a greater response than among the Ohio people at home, whom I have had the honor to represent in Congress, as was demonstrated in a series of these public meetings conducted previous to the second session of the Seventy-third Congress.

In several communities, in response to popular demand, it was necessary to repeat the same programs two and three times to accommodate those who were unable to get into the crowded building at previous forum sessions.

The response has always been the same from special professional, college, and university groups as that from groups composed of businessmen, wage earners, and the rank and file of men and women representing all walks of life.

POPULARIZING TECHNICAL SUBJECTS FOR PEOPLE WHO WANT TO BE MORE SUCCESSFUL

Further experiments were made to get the reactions of people to adult education on subjects usually conceded to be too abstract to popularize, but which can be made to yield information valuable to anyone ambitious to succeed in life.

As editor and publisher of a daily newspaper several years ago, I endeavored to learn the attitude of our newspaper readers toward adult education on such technical subjects as economics, sociology, psychology, dietetics, and so forth. To do this I conducted several forums as special educational features sponsored by my newspaper.

To assist in that part of this educational work, devoted to economics, sociology, and so forth, I engaged a noted authority, Attorney Lee Francis Lybarger, who had been highly recommended by my friend, Hon. Henry T. Rainey, distinguished Speaker of the National House of Representatives, who was himself one of America's foremost students of economic, political, and social questions.

This newspaper experiment in adult education proved to be one of the most popular as well as one of the most useful education features sponsored in all the many years I have been engaged in the newspaper business.

COMMENDED BY WARREN G. HARDING

The late President Warren G. Harding, with a number of his business and political friends, attended a number of our forums and commended them in the highest terms of appreciation.

These experiences I mention here in an effort to prove to my colleagues in Congress, the growing interest in adult, self-advancement type of education and to prove that the people, who no longer respond to the old political appeal, do very enthusiastically respond to the educational appeal which gives them a chance to ask questions and gain new facts so vitally essential to their intellectual equipment, if they are to keep abreast of the times in a rapidly changing world.

IT IS NEVER TOO LATE TO START MAKING OUR LIFE WHAT WE WANT IT TO BE

As a result of these personal experiments and humble efforts to open the doors of educational opportunity to larger numbers of people, I cannot help realizing how tragic it would be for this Congress to fail in giving approval to the bill under discussion. There can be no greater service than that of helping men and women to make the most of themselves at any age.

Its passage will give new hope and greater assurance of advancement for thousands of people in the years ahead. It will help people, regardless of age. It is never too late to start becoming what we might have been had we had a better chance in our earlier years.

Let no Member of this Congress underestimate the intellectual hunger of the radio-bored masses of people.

More men and more women are intellectually lonely today for the companionship of new ideas and new knowledge than ever before.

NEWTON D. BAKER WARNS SELF-SATISFIED MEN AND WOMEN THAT TO SUCCEED THEY MUST KEEP ON LEARNING

There is little hope for half-educated or self-satisfied people in these changing times.

Newton D. Baker, former Secretary of War, and frequently mentioned for the Presidency of the United States, says:

The man who graduates from college or university today and stops learning tomorrow is uneducated the day after.

This legislation makes it possible for people to continue their education through all the years of their adulthood.

The report of President Hoover's special committee on recent economic, business, and employment changes should awaken from their lethargy the intellectually indifferent who are satisfied with the education they received in school or college, and cause them to realize the imperative necessity for making investment in new training, new knowledge, and new ideas, if they hope to survive and get ahead, socially, vocationally, or financially.

TODAY IT IS EITHER LEARN OR PERISH

We are living in a swiftly changing world where people whose knowledge is stale and incomplete cannot compete.

Even in the most prosperous times employers are compelled to drop from their pay rolls the self-satisfied men and women who have quit learning.

The wage earner who does not have a program for self-improvement and who is not investing in new education of some kind eventually becomes mentally rusty and is as much of a menace to the industry that employs him as the machines that are allowed to become rusty and in need of repair.

Job-destroying, labor-saving devices, with electric brains and fingers of steel are daily forcing unprepared thousands out onto the dangerous precipice of unemployment and business uncertainty to face a jobless future. Today it is either learn or perish.

OUTWITTING YOUR MIDDLE-AGE DEADLINE

The middle-age deadline employment policy is crowding countless numbers past 35 and 40 over the precipice of employment uncertainty, partly because of their own neglect to keep their personalities, their knowledge, and their training up to date.

One way for people to outwit the fatal middle-age deadline is by modernizing their minds.

No employer gives a hang how old you are if you have an idea that is worth something.

The door of opportunity is everywhere being slammed shut in the empty, dull faces of smug, contented people who think they know enough.

Life ends at 40 for those who do not keep abreast of the times. There is no middle-age deadline for men and women who have new training, new ideas, and new knowledge.

Unfortunately the last thing people invest in is new ideas, new training, and new knowledge. Too many minds are out-of-date, antique models 20 years behind the times.

YOUR GREATEST DANGER

Because of the astounding new inventions, increasing thousands of labor-saving machines, billion-dollar merger combines, overproduction, chain-store distribution, merciless new competition, the middle-age deadline employment policy, and other alarming revolutionary changes that are coming with terrifying swiftness, millions who have let their training and knowledge get out of date, must quickly prepare themselves to readjust their lives by equipping themselves with new facts and new self-improvement or face stark tragedy.

THERE IS NO TRAGEDY GREATER THAN THE TRAGEDY OF BEING UNPREPARED

The late President Calvin Coolidge pointed the way to those ambitious to advance themselves, when he said:

The chief hope of the average man today is in his mind.

Those who have been listening to the apostles of despair, prophesying dangerous years ahead, should take new hope in the more optimistic predictions of those educators, employers, and business leaders who state that the so-called 5 dangerous years ahead will bring more reward, more happiness, more new opportunities for money making to those who modernize their training, their knowledge, and their thinking than have been known in any similar 5-year period in the business history of America.

But this hope is only for those who prepare and get ready for the new opportunities that are coming.

At the last session of Congress, we authorized the spending of millions to aid the unemployed and justly so; but there has been little organized effort in behalf of the unemployable who lack training, and who, in spite of rapidly growing

prosperity, will continue to remain unemployed unless they increase their earning ability by specialized education such as this bill provides.

NO GOVERNMENT CAN HELP PEOPLE WHO DO NOT HELP THEMSELVES

No matter how many billions of dollars the Government may spend to help people, yet much of the spending will be in vain unless people are encouraged to do something toward helping themselves by improving themselves.

No legislation, no government, can change the fundamental, basic law that to earn more it always will be necessary to learn more and be more.

The moment men and women stop learning that moment they begin slipping and no government on earth can do anything about that.

TO SUCCEED TODAY YOU MUST CREATE NEW CAUSES THAT RESULT IN SUCCESS—AND SELF-EDUCATION IS QUICKEST WAY TO DO IT

Individualism may give way to collectivism or to a variety of other "isms", but that will not change the fact that the individual, in the final analysis, will have to assume the responsibility of doing something for himself by following a program of self-development that will release and make usable his latent and often wasted ability.

Intellectual stagnation is probably the greatest calamity that can happen to a human being.

But intellectual stagnation, which handicaps people in getting jobs or holding jobs, will ever remain a matter under the exclusive control of the individual himself.

WHY DO SO MANY COLLEGE GRADUATES FAIL?

But, you ask, if more education is the means by which many of the unemployable can make themselves more certain of securing employment, then why are so many college and university graduates failures?

A part answer to that question is, our high schools, colleges, and universities, just like the railroads, banks, and most industries, have not been able to keep up with the new demands resulting from rapidly changing conditions and therefore have continued to graduate thousands annually equipped with obsolete education for which there is no demand and no market.

OVERSTUFFED MINDS

A "horse and buggy" education in an airplane world is one reason why so many college people fail.

Obsolescence in education is responsible for the graduating of overstuffed minds without trained thinking capacity, and the individual handicapped by a nonthinking mind has to be reeducated before he can be put on the pay roll at profit to himself or his employers. It is the thinking job that pays the biggest salary.

Stuffing a mind with so much that is of no use or which will soon be out of date and therefore, in a short time, have no value, does not make a thinking mind.

TO SUCCEED, STUDY SUCCESSFUL METHODS OF SUCCESSFUL MEN

Still another reason why so many college people fail in life, is that so many of their professors are failures, as they themselves frankly admit. Too many professors, upon whom students must rely for their education, have themselves never succeeded at anything; too much theory and not enough practical sense.

If you are planning to be a success in life, then it is highly important you learn from successful men the success methods by which they succeeded.

Merely because a man has a Ph. D. degree and a scholastic knowledge of the contents of books is no conclusive proof that he has either the capacity or the knowledge to educate students to be successful in life as it is lived today.

WHY MANY EDUCATORS AGREE WITH ARTHUR BRISBANE

Arthur Brisbane says:

Students who spend 4 years in college acquiring a technical education, which only a few ever will use afterwards, forfeit about 50 percent of their chance of attaining practical success in life by deducting from useful effort their 4 most important years.

Parking a mind on a college campus for 4 years does not educate it.

NEW METHODS IN ADULT EDUCATION

Chicago University, Columbia University, and many other leading universities of the country have done great work through their university extension courses in assisting people to acquire the additional margin of education necessary to increase their earning ability.

Those identified with the American Association for Adult Education, who recently held their annual convention in Washington, have done a great work in aiding people to secure the kind of knowledge necessary for their advancement.

Still another education service which makes available to adults in all walks of life a practical training that is original in that the facts are presented by the eye-learning methods almost exclusively, is the Peoples' Traveling University Service, to which I have personally devoted much time and money, in an effort to be of some slight service to men and women interested in self-education.

PICTURIZED KNOWLEDGE PUT INTO THE BRAIN THROUGH THE EYES

By means of hundreds of exhibits, stage demonstrations, and more than 2,000 colored financial and business charts, research findings of all kinds are simplified and so picturized by the Peoples' Traveling University Service, as to be easily understood and easily remembered.

By this eye-learning method new business facts from the Department of Commerce of the United States Government and other research bureaus of the Government are made practical and instantly usable to the thousands who have been eager to avail themselves of this training.

In an effort to make available to men and women of all ages and from all walks of life the researches in every field of science, this Peoples' University Service which, as previously stated, is a traveling university service, presents information in motion pictures, featuring the kind of knowledge which extensive surveys have shown most practical in aiding people to adjust themselves to changing business, employment, and economic conditions.

TO HELP MEN INCREASE THEIR EARNING ABILITY

A small fortune of thousands of dollars has been invested in the several tons of equipment necessary to present these unique educational programs.

The latest researches on advertising, salesmanship, personnel relations, business psychology, occupations, finance, and a wide variety of other subjects have been contributed by hundreds of business concerns and business leaders, philanthropic foundations, financial institutions, university research organizations, and prominent men and women in every vocational field.

All this vast storehouse of information is classified, organized, standardized, systemized, and put into the mind via the-eyeway-highway-to-the-brain method.

A LIFE PROGRAM FOR SELF-DEVELOPMENT

Not only do we bring the latest facts from every field of knowledge, including biology, psychology, finance, investment, economics, sociology, salesmanship, advertising, personnel relations, business, occupations, and so forth, but in addition to that, the Peoples University Service presents extensive information showing the various factors that decrease the earning power of the individual in over 3,000 occupations.

Self-study plans are provided and the students are shown how to organize a life program for continued self-education and self-development.

Sixty special-made trunks are used for shipping the business, scientific, educational exhibits and equipment used in presenting these modern business methods and personal advancement lessons featured by our Traveling University Service, which is the most extensive and the first service of its special kind in the field of adult education in this or any other country, so far as is known.

PEOPLES UNIVERSITY SERVICE MAKES LEARNING A PLEASURE

It is the purpose of educational service of this type to simplify some of the vast storehouse of technical knowledge heretofore available only to laboratory and academic tech-

nicians and make it understandable and usable for the man in the street.

My enthusiasm for this bill providing Federal aid in behalf of vocational education is very great because of having had opportunity to see with my own eyes how eager and hungry the masses of the people are for ideas, knowledge, training that will help them to be somebody and get somewhere in life.

PEOPLES UNIVERSITY SERVICE FORUMS APPEAL TO MEN AND WOMEN IN ALL WALKS OF LIFE

This business of adult education has been a sort of hobby of mine. For many years, I have devoted as much time as I could spare each year to this service which we call the Peoples University Service.

The Peoples University Service is a nonprofit service, but it has paid big dividends in happiness, friends, and the gratitude of more than a million two hundred thousand people in the United States and Canada who in 19 years have attended our business and self-advancement forums.

In our Peoples University Service forums have been bankers, doctors, lawyers, preachers, and men and women of all professions and vocations, including the public officials and Governors of several States. Sitting in the same audiences were laboring men, salesmen, clerks, stenographers, and people of every vocational interest and aptitude.

PEOPLE REALIZE THE HANDICAP OF AN OUT-OF-DATE MIND

This I mention to show that knowledge, training, or educational service designed to help the individual is universal in its appeal and is greatly needed.

If people were not interested in education, in self-improvement, in making the most of themselves, getting ahead, learning the new technique necessary to adjust themselves to changing conditions, then they would not crowd auditoriums in every city from coast to coast, as I have seen them do.

These personal experiences convince me that the Federal Government should hasten to join with the State governments to open the door of educational opportunity to the people of America as is being done by this legislation on which we are soon to vote. The amount of money we, as Members of Congress, are asked to authorize is an investment in happiness, in achievement, in citizenship, in opportunity for the masses of the people. There is little chance today for the man with an out-of-date mind.

EDUCATION BEYOND MONEY VALUE

The education, training, and information that will be made available to thousands under the provisions of this bill cannot be estimated in terms of dollars and cents alone. There are social, intellectual, spiritual values and intangible values that cannot be computed on any kind of adding machine. The contentment, the hope, the inspiration and aspiration, education, and training of the type we are providing in the bill before us comprise priceless values beyond computation.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S SPEECH

Most of us will admit that we can solve our old problems only by the application of new knowledge. In one of his great speeches to Congress, President Roosevelt said:

Fear and worry, based on unknown danger, contribute to social unrest and economic demoralization.

This kind of vocational and adult education helps remove some of the fear and worry to which the President referred.

The proper kind of vocational and adult education gives people scientific information about themselves, about life, opportunity; encourages self-analysis, self-understanding, self-development, self-expression, and self-realization.

Self-education shows people how to develop their ability and market their ability to better advantage. Facts were presented to our committee showing how this kind of vocational education kept hundreds off relief rolls and enabled them to provide for themselves.

This type of education teaches people how to discover and develop their unused mental resources, how to train themselves for more effective business thinking and more effective

living, how to plan their future in line with a definite success goal, and how to advance themselves by the scientific method from where they are today to where they want to be in life tomorrow.

FREEDING YOUR MIND FROM FEAR AND WORRY

This practical vocational and adult education does not deal in academic theories, but does deal in the kind of practical economic and business facts that enables men to free themselves from some of the fear and worry inspired by a sense of insecurity.

Educational agencies that aid men and women to adjust themselves happily to a changing world are doing something toward removing fear and worry, based on unknown danger, which contributes to the social unrest and economic demoralization.

This is the goal toward which President Roosevelt is directing the forces of the United States Government under his great constructive and fearless leadership.

The day President Roosevelt signs this bill providing for additional vocational education he will open the door of opportunity to grateful thousands in every State of the Union.

The President has been teaching the philosophy of the good neighbor. Before the eyes of the American people and the eyes of the world he has been living the philosophy of the good neighbor. By signing this vocational education bill the President will be demonstrating the philosophy of the good neighbor in a way that will increase for him the admiration and affection of every American citizen who appreciates his heroic, courageous leadership.

As individual self-improvement is the chief hope of the average man who wants to be successful, so is universal education the chief hope of democracy that wants to survive.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Education of the House, I attended practically all of the hearings which were held on this particular legislation. The pending bill is a compromise. I supported the original Lee bill and the Deen bill. As a result of the compromise, and after a lot of deliberation and many hearings, we decided upon the bill now under consideration. I want to stand by my distinguished chairman in the remarks he made on the floor of the House today that this bill has been reported out of the committee unanimously by the membership of that committee. I have had letters from the State director of vocational education, my State; from the chairman of home economics; from the executive secretary of the League of Nebraska Municipalities, all of them agreeing as to the good results obtained by vocational education. This league wants to retain parts of the Senate bill. However, Mr. Chairman, there is no argument as to the good which vocational education has done in our country. Every member of the committee is for vocational education.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma surrendered his bill to Mr. DEEN, of Georgia, because Mr. LEE was for vocational education. The majority of us got behind the Deen bill until we got into a sort of deadlock, and we decided on the \$6,000,000 bill instead of the \$12,000,000 bill. We wanted to reduce expenditures. Like my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FLETCHER], I favored the original bill, but fearing we would have no bill at all, I joined the rest of the membership of the committee, believing that this bill would be the bill we would discuss today, and only when I arrived on the floor today did I learn there was going to be an attempt made to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill.

There are things in the Senate bill favored by people in my State which I approve of and am for, but if the Senate bill is substituted for the House bill without section 6 of the House bill, which protects labor against the exploitation of those who are seeking slavery in our country, I say you are defeating the purpose of vocational education.

I hope every Member of this House will some time secure a copy of the confidential report brought to the Office of Education by representatives of labor and representatives of education, which indicates that public money has been used

in exploiting slave labor in our country. I hope the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEEN], who has agreed to accept section 6 of the House bill, of which I am the author, will continue the agreement when he proposes the Senate bill for the House bill.

Mr. DEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. DEEN. The gentleman has made a very valuable statement, and is a good member of the committee and is my friend and colleague. The gentleman knows I have no intention of deserting any agreement with respect to retaining his amendment to the Senate bill if the Senate bill is substituted for my bill. I have agreed to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to thank the gentleman, and I hope he will accept my section 6.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be a member of the Committee on Education and it had not been my intention to have any remarks to make with regard to this proposed legislation this afternoon, but since I learned that the George bill is going to be offered as a substitute, I want to appeal to the membership of the House to sustain the Committee on Education and to sustain the chairman in the bill that has been brought forward.

There are those in the United States who question the advisability of the United States Government having too much to say about our educational system; in other words, there are those who still believe that the question of education is still a State matter and ought to be handled in that way.

There is no argument here about the vocational proposition being beneficial, and I am for it, but I take it if we enact the George bill, whereby we do not have to match Federal funds with State funds, it will not be much longer until there will be legislation here where the Federal Government will be asked to do it all, and there will be no matching of any amount. It seems to be the tendency of the country today to ask Uncle Sam to do everything. I do not believe it would be well for the States of this Union to urge or bring about a condition whereby all support of education comes from Washington and I think, too, that we ought to be a little careful about the extent to which we increase this appropriation.

I feel the bill that has been reported by the committee is a rather liberal increase over the amount that is provided in the legislation under which we are now living, and I would caution the membership of the House about increasing this appropriation to the extent that it is increased under the George bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of providing for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1937, the sum of \$6,000,000; for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1938, the sum of \$6,000,000; and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1939, the sum of \$6,000,000: Provided, That the several States and Territories shall not be required to match more than 50 percent of the appropriations authorized under the provisions of this section. One-third of this sum each year shall be allotted to the States and Territories in the proportion that their farm population bears to the total farm population of the United States and Territories, according to the United States census last preceding the end of the fiscal year in which any such allotment is to be made. One-third of the sum appropriated for each fiscal year shall be allotted to the States and Territories in the proportion that their nonfarm population bears to the total nonfarm population of the United States and Territories, according to the United States census last preceding the end of the fiscal year in which any such allotment is to be made: Provided, further, That the allotment of funds to any State or Territory for each of the three purposes enumerated in

this section shall be not less than a minimum of \$10,000 for any fiscal year, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1937, the sum of \$175,000, or so much thereof as may be needed, which shall be used for the purpose of providing the minimum allotments to the States and Territories provided for in this section; for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1938, the sum of \$175,000, or so much thereof as may be needed, which shall be used for the purpose of providing the minimum allotments to the States and Territories provided for in this section; and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1939, the sum of \$175,000, or so much thereof as may be needed, which shall be used for the purpose of providing the minimum allotments to the States and Territories provided for in this section.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the figures, strike out:

Provided, That the several States and Territories shall not be required to match more than 50 percent of the appropriations authorized under the provisions of this section.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment. I do not desire to add very much to what I was saying a few moments ago. This is the provision of the bill to which I had reference. When the committee first drafted the bill, it inserted this proviso, which would have allowed 50 percent of the \$6,000,000 authorization to be allocated to the States without being matched and, therefore, would have afforded some opportunity to the States that are in such financial distress that they are unable to match in full the Federal funds and to the communities in those States, which because of low property values are unable to furnish any portion of the amount of money necessary to match Federal funds, to secure some benefits under the provisions of the bill. If this committee amendment striking out this provision is voted down, then 50 percent of the \$6,000,000 will be allocated to the States, and, therefore, to the communities and subdivisions of the States, which may not be able to match the amount in full, and it is my earnest hope that action may be taken by the committee to that end in order that those who are most in need of this aid may receive some of the benefits of the money.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. My friend is very clear in matters of this sort and I fear he may be laboring under an erroneous conclusion with reference to the provisions of existing law and the effect of opposing this committee amendment.

Mr. TARVER. I should be very glad if I am in error to have the gentleman point out wherein that is so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Some here are indulging in the hope that in view of the very conditions the gentleman from Georgia has expressed with reference to the poverty of some sections, that at least a part of this appropriation shall be expended without matching, at least temporarily.

Mr. TARVER. That is what I am endeavoring to have done, and if the committee amendment be adopted and this provision be stricken out, then under the provisions of the following sections of the bill, especially section 5, as to the method of allocating between the States, all of it will have to be matched. If you vote down the committee amendment and leave the proviso in the bill, then only 50 percent of it will have to be matched. I take it the gentleman from Alabama is in accord with my position.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes. I fear I misinterpreted the gentleman's attitude.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. If the House should turn down the entire House bill and adopt the Senate bill, there is no question but that it would be unnecessary to match in full the Federal money.

Mr. TARVER. I do not know what the House will do, but if you want to have half the money not matched, then vote down this committee amendment. If you want to require that the States match the money in full, then vote for the committee amendment.

Mr. NICHOLS. And if the committee amendment is voted down, would it then be necessary to further amend the bill before the conditions the gentleman is talking about would prevail?

Mr. TARVER. No. If the committee amendment is voted down, it leaves in the bill the proviso which would insure that \$3,000,000 of this money will be distributed between the States without matching. If the committee amendment is adopted, all of it will have to be matched.

Mr. NICHOLS. I take it that the gentleman probably thinks it would be a wise thing to adopt the Senate bill as an amendment, but for fear that will not be done, the gentleman thinks this amendment should be voted down.

Mr. TARVER. No. I do not think that we are warranted at this time in increasing the amount of this allocation by fourfold. I think that doubling the amount is amply sufficient for the present in view of the financial condition of the Government. I represent an agricultural district, and there is no one in this House more interested in the cause of vocational education than I am.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. But even if the committee amendment is voted down and the Senate bill is not adopted, the State then will have to match at least 50 percent of it.

Mr. TARVER. They will have to match 50 percent. If you do not vote the committee amendment down, they will have to match it all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "made", insert "for the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects in such States and Territories."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 15, after the word "made", insert "and shall be used for the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of home economics subjects in such States and Territories."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 23, after the word "made", insert "and shall be used for the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of trade and industrial education subjects in such States and Territories."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 3, line 1, after the word "Provided", strike out the word "further."

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the Committee did not adopt the first amendment offered by the committee, it will be necessary to vote this amendment down, because the first proviso appeared on page 1. Of course, this is the second proviso.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the last committee amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Cox: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That for the purpose of providing for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1937, and annually thereafter, the sum of \$12,000,000: *Provided*, That the several States and Territories shall be required to match by State or local funds, or both, 50 percent of the appropriations authorized under the provisions of this section until June 30, 1942; 60 percent for the year ending June 30, 1943; 70 percent for the year ending June 30, 1944; 80 percent for the year ending June 30, 1945; 90 percent for the year ending June 30, 1946; and annually thereafter 100 percent of the appropriations authorized under the provisions of this section. One-third of this sum each year shall be allotted to the States and Territories in the proportion that their farm population bears to the total farm population

of the United States and Territories, according to the United States census last preceding the end of the fiscal year in which any such allotment is made, and shall be used for the salaries and necessary travel expenses of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects in such States and Territories. One-third of the sum appropriated for each fiscal year shall be allotted to the States and Territories in the proportion that their rural population bears to the total rural population of the United States and Territories, according to the United States census last preceding the end of the fiscal year in which any such allotment is to be made, and shall be used for the salaries and necessary travel expenses of teachers, supervisors, and directors of trade and industrial subjects, including public and other service occupations, in such States and Territories: *Provided further*, That the allotment of funds to any State or Territory for each of the three purposes enumerated in this section shall be not less than a minimum of \$20,000 for any fiscal year, 50 percent of which shall be matched by State or local funds, or both, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1937, and annually thereafter the sum of \$175,000, or so much thereof as may be needed, which shall be used for the purpose of providing the minimum allotments to the States and Territories provided for in this section.

"Sec. 2. In addition to the sum authorized to be appropriated by section 1 hereof, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, and required to be matched in the same proportions as such sum, the sum of \$1,200,000, to be allotted to the States and Territories in the proportion that their total population bears to the total population of the United States and Territories, according to the United States census last preceding the end of the fiscal year in which any such allotment is made, and shall be used for the salaries and necessary travel expenses of teachers, supervisors, and directors of, and maintenance of teacher training in, distributive occupational subjects in such States and Territories: *Provided, however*, That the allotment of funds to any State or Territory for the purpose of this section shall be not less than a minimum of \$10,000 for any fiscal year after July 1, 1937, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1937, and annually thereafter the sum of \$54,000, or so much thereof as may be needed, which shall be used for the purpose of providing the minimum allotments to the States and Territories provided for in this section.

"Sec. 3. That for the purpose of cooperating with the States and Territories in preparing teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural, trade and industrial, and home-economics subjects there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the use of the several States and Territories for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1937, and annually thereafter the sum of \$1,000,000. Said sum shall be allotted to the several States and Territories in the proportion which their population bears to the total population of the United States and Territories, according to the last preceding United States census: *Provided*, That the allotment of funds to any State or Territory shall be not less than a minimum of \$10,000 for any fiscal year. And there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning after the enactment of the act and annually thereafter the sum of \$54,000, or so much thereof as may be needed, which shall be used for the purpose of providing the minimum allotments to the States and Territories provided for in this section.

"Sec. 4. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Office of Education, Department of the Interior, for vocational education, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1937, and annually thereafter the sum of \$350,000, to be expended for the same purposes and in the same manner as provided in section 7 of the act approved February 23, 1917, as amended October 6, 1917.

"Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department, shall, upon the certification of the United States Commissioner of Education, pay, in equal semiannual payments, on the 1st day of July and January of each year, to the custodian for vocational education of each State and Territory designated in the act approved February 23, 1917, the moneys to which the State or Territory is entitled under the provisions of this act.

"Sec. 6. The appropriations made by this act shall be in addition to, and shall be subject to the same conditions and limitations as, the appropriations made by the act entitled 'An act to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide co-operation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture and in the trades and industries; to provide co-operation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditures', approved February 23, 1917, except that the appropriations made by this act for home economics shall be subject to the conditions and limitations applicable to the appropriation for agricultural purposes under such act of February 23, 1917, with the exception of that part of section 10 thereof which requires directed or supervised practice for at least 6 months per year; that such moneys as are provided by this act for trade and industrial subjects, including public and other service occupations, may be expended for part-time classes operated for less than 144 hours per

year; that the provisions of section 11 of the act of February 23, 1917, requiring at least one-third of the sum appropriated to any State to be expended for part-time schools or classes shall be held to include any part-time day-school classes for workers 14 years of age and over, and evening-school classes for workers 16 years of age and over; except that the appropriations made by this act for distributive occupational subjects shall be limited to part-time and evening schools as provided in said act of February 23, 1917, for trade, home economics, and industrial subjects and as qualified by the provisions of this section; and that the appropriations available under section 4 of this act shall be available for expenses of attendance at meeting of educational associations and other organizations and for expenses of conferees called to meet in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, which, in the opinion of the Commissioner, are necessary for the efficient discharge of the provisions of this act.

"Sec. 7. The appropriations authorized by this act shall be in lieu thereof and not in addition to the appropriations authorized in sections 1 and 2 of Public Law No. 245, Seventy-third Congress, approved May 21, 1934.

"Sec. 8. As used in this act the term 'States and Territories' means the several States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, the island of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia."

Mr. PALMISANO (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this amendment is not germane. This is the Senate bill.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether or not the dispensing of the reading of the amendment would dispense with the reading of the House bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has offered an amendment, which the Chair understands is in the words and figures of the Senate bill. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will continue reading the amendment.

Mr. MILLARD (interrupting the further reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this amendment is not germane.

The Senate bill injects a new matter entirely to that in the House bill. Vocational training from 1917 to date has always been for the purpose of training individuals and not groups. It was for the purpose of individuals obtaining an education voluntarily. We are now injecting, by this amendment, a provision that would force education by the State or municipal governments. The amendment provides that the municipal agent, whether he desires an education or not, under the instruction of his master, who may not be a teacher in vocational training, must take that education. In that connection let me cite the rules of the House, on page 365, referring to germaneness:

One individual proposition may not be amended by another individual proposition even though the two belong to the same class.

That was shown recently when we considered the Frazier-Lemke bill. There was a provision attempting to loan money to the farmers of the country, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation took up the same subject. The amendment to the Frazier-Lemke bill was ruled out of order because it was another subject matter.

Reading further from the rules:

Thus the following were not germane:

To a bill proposing the admission of one Territory into the Union, an amendment for admission of another Territory.

To a bill for the relief of one individual, an amendment proposing similar relief for another.

To a resolution providing for a special order for one bill, an amendment to include another bill.

I say this is entirely new matter. It may appear that it is extending vocational training, but the fact is that they are now attempting to teach not individuals but groups of public employees throughout the various States of the Union. I say it is not similar to the bill before the House. The intention of vocational training was to teach boys and girls who wanted an education voluntarily. This amendment would be the enforcement of an education upon men who have a training themselves by someone, as the testimony shows, who will later obtain an education from one in authority, and then he will divulge that education to someone else in the other jurisdiction, who is also in charge.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard briefly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from California before the close of the argument.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief in answering the arguments made by the gentleman from Maryland. The exclusive proposition now presented to the Chair is upon the point of order made by the gentleman from Maryland, that the Senate bill is not germane to the House bill. Without undertaking to go into the various comparisons of one section of the House bill and a similar section of the Senate bill, even a casual examination of the provisions of the two bills, it seems to me, would clearly convince the Chair that the major purposes sought to be effectuated by the two bills are identical in purpose and design.

It is true there may be some incidental or minor differences with reference to the regulations set up, or with reference to some details of the bill there may be differences; but upon the point now presented of the germaneness of the Senate bill to the House bill, it seems to me rather clear, certainly, that the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care to pursue the argument further than this statement of the general principles involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from California on the point of order.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard briefly on the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, in the past vocational education bills have had to do with agricultural training, home economics, and training in trade and in industry. I call the Chair's attention to section 2 of the Senate bill under consideration as an amendment, which section injects into the picture two other proposals. I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that the injection of these new proposals is in violation of section 7 of rule XVI of the House relative to germaneness, reading as follows:

No motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, the point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds the title of the Senate bill, the provisions of which are included in the pending amendment, and the title of the House bill which it would amend to be the same. Both provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories. An examination of the text of the bills indicate that to a considerable extent they carry the same provisions; but, as pointed out by the gentleman from California, the Senate bill adds to the provisions of the House bill certain fields of vocational training in public and other service occupations.

The Chair finds in Cannon's Procedure, on the subject of germaneness, this paragraph:

That an amendment to be germane means that it must be akin to or relative to the subject matter of the bill. It must be an

amendment that would appropriately be considered in connection with the bill.

Both the amendment and the House bill deal with the subject of vocational education.

The Chair quotes from the definition of vocational education given in Webster's dictionary the following statement:

A vocational school is a school the main purpose of which is to provide training for the occupations or vocations whether in the professions, commerce, or trade.

In the opinion of the Chair the pending amendment, as stated by the gentleman from Alabama, seeks to effectuate the identical purposes of the House bill except to carry those purposes a bit further and to provide a larger appropriation for them.

The Chair, therefore, holds that the amendment is germane and overrules the point of order.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, whatever I might say in support of this amendment would be in part at least a repetition of arguments already made dealing with the relative merits of the House and Senate bills.

It has been developed in the consideration of this measure up to this point that the Committee on Education reporting the House bill is tremendously interested in the adoption of the legislation. There is, however, an indication of difference as between members of the committee over the amount of appropriation that should be authorized. The Senate bill—you will recall the statement made by the author of the House bill—is the bill upon which the hearing before the Committee on Education of the House was had; that is, the two bills were identical. The change in the bills as they now are was brought about by amendments made by the Committee on Education, which resulted in the original bill being withdrawn and reintroduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEEN].

I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN to the amendment offered by Mr. Cox: On page 7, line 12, after the word "act" and the period, insert a new section:

"Sec. 6-a. No part of the appropriation herein authorized shall be expended in industrial-plant training programs, except such industrial-plant training be bona-fide vocational training and not a device to utilize the services of vocational trainees for private profit."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the hour is getting late, and I shall not take the 5 minutes to which I am entitled.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit an interruption, I may say that so far as I know the amendment is agreeable to all concerned, if it is to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Maryland that the amendment now pending is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I would call attention to the fact that the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska is already in the House bill; so the question involved here is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Vocational education has been progressing with an appropriation of \$3,000,000 a year. We have increased that to \$6,000,000 a year. The pending bill increases the present amount by \$4,000,000. By adopting the Senate bill as an amendment, the amount will be increased to \$12,000,000, a 300-percent increase; and there was absolutely no testimony before the committee to warrant any increase whatever.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the matter before the House, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland will proceed in order.

Mr. PALMISANO. The amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska is already contained in the House bill. The question involved is \$12,000,000. I say, gentlemen, vote against both amendments, and pass the House bill with \$6,000,000 instead of the Senate bill with \$12,000,000. To adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska would be to make it appear that we are in sympathy with the Senate bill.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the Members should vote against both amendments and proceed to pass the House bill as reported by the committee, because that bill has been unanimously reported. Some folks back home have sent telegrams up here to Members urging that they not stand by the committee, and now we find a different proposition before the House. Three separate votes were taken on this bill, and I ask the Members to stand by the committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO], it seems to me, has offered a rather novel argument. He admits the merit of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], but merely for the purpose of adding strength to his opposition to the Senate bill he asks the House to vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska. I understand the gentleman from Maryland is perfectly agreeable to having this proposition in the House bill, and, as a matter of fact, his committee accepted it. It seems to me in order to properly present the matter to the House. The gentleman from Maryland should gladly accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska. I would like to have the gentleman from Maryland give the Members of the House a real good argument why the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska should not be adopted as an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia. The gentleman has offered no argument against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. PALMISANO. It is already contained in the House bill.

Mr. BOILEAU. It is in the House bill, but it is not in the amendment that will be next voted upon by the Members of the House. It seems to me, in the interest of clarity, in the interest of good legislation, and in the interest of presenting the matter fairly to the House, the amendment should be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD of Mississippi to the amendment offered by Mr. Cox of Georgia: On page 3 of the amendment, strike out the following words in line 6: "including public and other service occupations."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, this is the language of the bill to which the opposition rather strenuously objected. I cannot see that it will injure the legislation; therefore I accept the amendment and hope it will be adopted by the House.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, in considering the proposed legislation now before us for the promotion of vocational education through Federal aid for that purpose, I feel that there is not a Member of this House who would attempt to deny that free public instruction is one of the most valuable undertakings of an organized government. I insist that popular education is the basis of freedom and of justice in that it offers the fullest opportunity for every person to rise in the world in keeping with democratic ideals. By means of education the road to success is kept open to all who are willing to exert the effort required to travel it.

I am happy to have consistently and actively supported the idea of a permanent policy of Federal aid to education, and at the present time there is pending before the House Committee on Education a bill I introduced on March 4, 1935, H. R. 6370, embodying a plan which would make available \$100,000,000 a year for Federal aid to public education in the several States, and sufficient provision is therein included to make this assistance a permanent policy of the United States Government, control of the funds to be exclusively exercised by the State and local educational authorities. I serve notice on the House and on the Committee on Education, of which I am a member, that the school children, the parents, the bus drivers, the school teachers, and the overburdened local taxpayers, of this country appreciate the merits of this proposal and are demanding this assistance to which they are entitled. The fight for its approval will be continued until victory crowns our efforts.

Today we are considering Federal aid to vocational education, since the Committee on Education has reported a bill to the House, H. R. 12120, authorizing the appropriation of \$6,000,000 a year for the next 3 years to be devoted to this purpose. While our committee was studying this measure I, and a number of the other members of the committee, wanted the authorization placed at \$12,000,000 a year and the Federal aid so given made a permanent proposition, not limited to any term of years. The committee, acting by majority vote, rejected our proposals and reported H. R. 12120, carrying an authorization for the \$6,000,000 and with the 3-year limitation.

But the situation is not beyond hope of successful remedy. The Senate has already passed its vocational-education bill, and that measure carries the \$12,000,000 authorization as a permanent policy—exactly the same thing we tried to secure in the Committee on Education.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEEN], author of the House bill reported from the committee, has stood up here this afternoon and splendidly declared that pride of authorship does not go so far with him as does a sincere desire to see something really worth while done to improve the educational opportunities of the boys and girls of our country, and that he hopes that the provisions of the Senate bill will be adopted in place of the enactment of his bill.

It will be an easy parliamentary process for the House to now adopt the provisions of the Senate bill. All we will have to do is simply to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and insert in place of the stricken matter the provisions of the Senate bill. A majority in behalf of the amendment—carrying the Senate provisions—offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] will accomplish the desired purpose.

Twelve million dollars a year and a permanent policy of assistance to vocational education will be the result of the adoption of the amendment. In urging you to adopt the amendment I do not feel that I am deserting my committee, as I wanted the more liberal provision made in the committee before the bill came to the floor. I thought we had debate and amendment on the floor in order that we might be able to correct just such situations as this now confronting the advocates of suitable assistance to education. Even if I had to desert a committee, I would do it without hesitation if I considered it necessary to effect the result essential to the best interests of the people. Committee allegiance cannot come ahead of allegiance to duty.

The gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] calls attention to the fact that regardless of whether we pass a bill at this time under the operation of the Smith-Hughes Act, \$7,382,000 per annum will, from year to year, be made available to vocational education over and above the amounts otherwise provided. That is correct, but we know, and the school children and parents know, that we need this \$12,000,000 in addition to that which will be obtained under the Smith-Hughes Act. The need appears all the more pressing when we consider that the act of May 21, 1934, which has also provided \$3,184,000 since date of enactment, will expire in another year, leaving that sum no longer available.

The funds made available by the legislation now under consideration will be used for agricultural education for our farm boys, for home science education for the girls who are interested in learning better methods of home management, and for vocational training in trades and industry. Money could not be expended to a purpose any better than to equip boys and girls to lead a more useful and abundant life. This will certainly enable them to improve upon their opportunities, to the benefit of themselves and their associates.

I have offered an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia which would strike out the words "including public and other service occupations." If my amendment to the amendment prevails, it will mean that none of the funds will be used for training people to be firemen or policemen or public officials or similar undertakings, and will reserve all the money for the education of the boys and girls in the fields I have just mentioned.

Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to again urge that the amendment to make \$12,000,000 available as a permanent policy be agreed to, and that my amendment to the amendment also be agreed to in order that possible undesired complications may be prevented.

A test of the friendship of this House for the children of this country trying to get an education and for the parents and teachers trying to give it to them has come. I cannot think that we will violate our trust.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Ford] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman of the Education Committee a few questions? What is the amount of the appropriation now for vocational training?

Mr. PALMISANO. \$3,000,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. That expires next year?

Mr. PALMISANO. It expires next year; yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The purpose of both of these bills is to continue vocational education beyond next year?

Mr. PALMISANO. The House bill continues it for 3 years with an increase in the appropriation to \$6,000,000. The Senate bill makes it a permanent proposition.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, the appropriation is \$3,000,000?

Mr. PALMISANO. \$3,000,000; yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The House bill increases the appropriation 100 percent?

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the Senate bill increases it 300 percent?

Mr. PALMISANO. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is all I want to know.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I have the information I wanted.

Mr. PALMISANO. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that, under the House bill, the program is continued for 3 years as it has been since 1917, and, under the Senate bill, it would be made a permanent proposition at \$12,000,000 a year. The original Smith-Hughes bill appropriated \$500,000, which was to be continued and increased until it reached \$6,000,000. We are now providing the \$6,000,000 which was to be the permanent amount under the original Smith-Hughes Act. Now they are asking for \$12,000,000, which would double the amount that was originally anticipated.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield and tell us where we are going to get the money?

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LAMNECK. Do I understand that the Senate bill also provides for an appropriation for all time after 1946?

Mr. McCORMACK. I rose in order to get time to ask certain questions. Can the gentleman from Maryland answer the question of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. PALMISANO. Under the Senate bill it is to be a permanent proposition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I realize there is some little feeling on behalf of the committee for their own bill. Personally, I think the committee, although made up of various classes of representation here in the House, has been fair and has gone along pretty well with this matter, but the Senate bill, known as the George bill, as I understand, was never before the committee. The bill was passed after the committee had acted upon the matter. It is true they did discuss, as I understand, the question of whether the amount should be \$6,000,000 or \$12,000,000 and decided upon \$6,000,000, although there were a great many of them who then, as now, were in favor of \$12,000,000.

I have no criticism to offer of the committee in asking us to stand by the majority report, but with respect to a question like this, it seems to me the members of the committee ought not to be such sticklers for little technicalities. In my estimation \$12,000,000 is not too much. We do not have enough now and we cannot appropriate too much for a cause like this.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. Yes; for a question.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman yields for just a question, and I have to make it short, may I say that while we are talking all the time about spending I would like to know where you are going to get the money.

Mr. FULLER. It is easy to know where we are going to get the money. We will get it off of the manufacturers of Pennsylvania and they will never even feel it. Money wisely spent for education of those unable to pay their way through colleges is always a good investment.

Mr. RICH. And when you get through you will have wrecked the country.

Mr. FULLER. Oh, no. Do not take up all my time.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. I hope the gentleman will excuse me, as I only have a little more time. The gentleman has spoken on the measure and there are some Members on our side who want to speak on this amendment, because they were in favor of the George bill and could not get recognition. However, this is a forum where we can all speak a little.

Mr. Chairman, I know the needs of the country boys. Some of you gentlemen who live in cities and have had fine opportunities and have not had to patronize the public schools may not realize the importance of this proposition, but I know what it is for a poor farmer boy to crave an education. I never had any opportunity for college education in my own life, and I know what it means to the farm boys who go out and work their way through school. This bill will give them an opportunity to learn a vocation or a profession. It also gives them an opportunity to be taught a trade, and, more than this, they teach the girls of the country their duties as wives and mothers. They further teach them things which they have never before had an opportunity to be taught. The children of the rich and those able to attend college do not take vocational training or attend these schools. Such schools teach practical thrift and economy, and, in addition to teaching trades, make better farmers. They teach the girls how housewives can make a dollar go further, how to buy, manage the home budget, and get the best results from earnings, besides health features. The present program and appropriation cannot take care of one-half the demand or afford teachers living wages. This allowance, although larger than formerly, is really economy. This bill will just be known as the George-Deen measure, and the poor boys and girls of the country will hold in grateful remembrance not only the authors but all who support this worthy measure. Let us take care of the young people who seek an education and they will, in appreciation, later take care of our governmental needs. I hope the

amendment containing the provisions of the George bill is adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I imagine some Members may get tired of the reiteration of the statements so often made by me on the floor of the House that in my deliberate judgment, although I may be in error in my conclusions, the very best money spent by the Federal Government is for appropriations for the Public Health Service and those appropriations for vocational education in its various phases. [Applause.]

I have been in Congress over a period of a good many years now, by the kindness and indulgence of my constituents, and ever since I came to Congress 20 years ago, at which time at my own request I was placed for a number of years on the House Committee on Education, I think I make a fair statement that from a very modest beginning, as far as appropriations and activities are concerned, I have seen this program of Federal leadership and stimulation for vocational education grow, not only in effectiveness but also in the confidence and appreciation of the American people. [Applause.] It is true that we are spending tremendous amounts of money. We have voted for some appropriation bills at this session of Congress that were very distasteful to me because of the tremendous amounts of money involved in them which I feared were not going to be expended for any humanitarian or benevolent purpose or to accentuate the needs of social justice in this country; but they have passed. But here is an act, not an appropriation, mind you, but an authorization for an appropriation, to quite largely increase—and I say that frankly—the authorization for vocational education.

I was one of those who in the hearings before the committee 3 years ago on the George-Elzey bill insisted that this appropriation should not only go to the benefit of the country boys and girls, but that at least one-third of it should be devoted, as it is now devoted under existing law, to the education of boys and girls of the towns and cities in industrial training. Sitting in my place behind that table during this Easter period and for a number of weeks, I have seen day after day file into the galleries of this Chamber the youth of our country—high-school boys and girls now being trained in the schools of this country to take up the burdens of citizenship when we older men shall lay them down; and the only objective that I have had in mind during all of these 20 years in advocating liberal appropriations for vocational education has been that these American youths shall have a fair, reasonable, decent opportunity in the country precincts and in the city precincts to be trained in head and in heart and in hand so that they might adequately cope with the problems of life as intelligent creatures, and not be deprived of the benefits of vocational education that would train them in the useful trades and arts and sciences, in agriculture, and in domestic industry to take up these burdens. I have always felt that it is at least partly the duty of the Federal Government to make reasonably fair appropriations for this purpose. I am not afraid of this \$12,000,000 appropriation for this purpose, because I believe that as far as the youths of our country are concerned—and they lay heavily upon our hearts, of course—it is the best money that we can spend. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PALMISANO) there were—ayes 125, noes 51.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise and report the bill to the House.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROBERTSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12120, and he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WHEELING COAL PLAN

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on a bill I introduced yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I introduced yesterday House Joint Resolution 596 that has for its purpose the granting to the coal States the right to enter into compacts with each other, for the purpose of stabilizing the coal industry. The provisions of the joint resolution are as follows:

That the consent of the Congress of the United States is hereby given to the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee, or any two or more of them, to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts for conserving and stabilizing the production and sale of coal, and such agreements may authorize the forming of competitive zones to regulate the production and sale of such coal, under State and governmental guidance with the express purpose of securing a fair profit for the capital invested in such business, as well as a fair and living wage for the employees engaged in such mining and production.

SEC. 2. No such compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State, or its producers or miners of coal, unless and until it has been approved by the legislatures of each of the States whose assent is contemplated by the terms of the compact or agreement and by the Congress.

This joint resolution is based on what is known as the Wheeling coal plan, the details of which were worked out and recommended by the Wheeling Chamber of Commerce. The plan, as recommended by this association, is as follows:

WHEELING COAL PLAN

1. Form the coal industry into competitive zones.
2. State and governmental control is not advocated. State and governmental guidance for legal reasons is necessitated.
3. Name the Governor of each State the coal administrator of his State. Have the Governors of the States in the competitive zones form an administrative tribunal.
4. The tribunal will:
 - (a) Organize the operators of each zone in a unit.
 - (b) Retain engineers to ascertain production in consumption, definitely rate each property, so that production is balanced in relativity to consumption by zone, by State, by district, by operation, by year, by month, and by day.
5. Cooperation by labor and capital, so that employee gets a living wage and employer a fair profit. Employees are encouraged to organize into associations for mutual self-help.

The sponsors of this code believe that the future of the Nation depends on coal and offer to cooperate with the Government, the State, labor, the operator, and the public to solve the problem.

Zone the coal industry as follows:

1. Lake zone, comprising Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee. Approximate tonnage, 392,000,000. The personnel of the administrative tribunal for this zone would comprise the Governors of Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee.
2. Tidewater zone, comprising Virginia and Maryland. Approximate tonnage, 17,000,000. Central Pennsylvania properly belongs in this zone. The personnel of the administrative tribunal for this zone would comprise the Governors of Virginia and Maryland.
3. Midwest zone, comprising Illinois and Indiana. Approximate tonnage, 93,000,000. Western Kentucky properly

belongs in this zone. The personnel of the administrative tribunal for this zone would comprise the Governors of Illinois and Indiana.

4. Southern zone comprises Alabama. Approximate tonnage, 21,000,000, and so forth.

Geographical zones have been selected where competition is most acute. Other zones can be formed in States or sections of States not already zoned. The tonnage of the industry zoned in 1926 approximates 523,000,000 tons, or 91.2 percent of the Nation's total production.

Strong belief is affirmed in private ownership. Initially, however, the Governors must act as the Moses to lead the industry out of the wilderness. The States can legally do this, as they will exercise their own sovereignty in saving a natural resource. When the plan functions, the tribunal of Governors could resign. A commissioner could be appointed by the operators of each State. These commissioners, instead of the Governors, would then comprise the tribunal for each zone. If desired, a national commissioner could be appointed by the operators to direct the entire industry, like Judge Landis in baseball, or the Honorable Will Hays in the motion-picture industry.

Productive schedules would be given operators 2 weeks in advance for the ensuing month, showing the number of days to operate and tonnage per diem. As insurance companies through experience base premiums on a mortality table, so eventually time would produce a productive table, scientifically arranged, so that each property would work 250 days a year with a fixed and set personnel.

No consumer of coal, large or small, with a social conscience, desires to pay a price that means starvation to miners and bankruptcy to operators. The price of the product should be such that the miner gets a living wage and the operator a fair profit.

After careful analysis and study, it is our opinion that 50 operators getting away from the law of the jungle and co-operating could save an industry, classed as basic by the President of the United States, and that is a public necessity in peace and in war, in which there are billions of dollars invested and upon which 2 percent of the Nation's population depends, directly for a livelihood, and all America in some degree, directly or indirectly, for comfort and existence.

CHECK WEIGHMEN

It is our opinion that every mine should have a check weighman. The check weighman should be a member of the department of mines in every State and sent to the mine by the State. His remuneration should be set by the States and paid by the cutters and loaders at the mine he is working. Check weighmen should be changed from mine to mine, and changed frequently, so that they will not be partial to either miner or operator.

COMPANY STORES

The company store was once a positive utility. Mines were in isolated districts, but the invention of the automobile has made them less of a utility, but still in many cases a necessity.

Compulsory trading should be absolutely prohibited. The administration of the company stores should be checked by the State mine department, so that there would be no excessive profiteering.

SCRIPT

Script is not legal tender in the payment of wages. Consequently its use should be completely prohibited.

COMPANY HOUSES

Occupancy should not be compulsory. Sanitary laws of the State or district should be enforced. Rental should be nominal.

It is obvious to students of the bituminous-coal industry that time has supplanted the old central competitive field, comprising Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Conditions call for new alignments, and thus this new competitive field is suggested. Steam coal alone has been considered. Geographical districts have been selected where competition is most acute. Other sections in States designated or States unnamed can later on be included. The tonnage in the field

named approximates 150,000,000 tons per annum, or one-third of the Nation's total production.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the Judiciary Committee will at once report out this bill, and that the Congress will pass the same at this session, and give to these States interested a chance to work out their own salvation.

CURRENT ATTACKS ON IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by inserting a radio speech I made over the National Broadcasting Co.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address made over a National Broadcasting Co. network Thursday, April 23, 1936, as follows:

I desire this evening to explain to my radio audience some of the tactics being employed by certain opponents of the Kerr-Coolidge bill in their efforts to prevent orderly consideration of this bill on its own merits on the floors of both Houses of Congress. At the outset permit me to make this unqualified statement, which can easily be verified by anyone who will care to examine its provisions: The Kerr-Coolidge bill, as amended, is not a liberal immigration measure but a deportation bill of drastic nature.

Let me impress upon you that this Kerr-Coolidge bill is the only major legislative proposal dealing in general with aliens within the United States that has been favorably reported from the appropriate committees of both the United States Senate and the House of Representatives during this Congress and is awaiting consideration on the floors of both Houses of Congress.

Opponents of the Kerr-Coolidge bill have succeeded in having another bill introduced in Congress, the so-called Starnes-Reynolds bill, as a sort of buffer bill, toward which all antialien groups in the country can direct their support. There is even a rumor heard occasionally that an effort will be made to offer the Starnes-Reynolds bill as an amendment in substitution for the text of the Kerr-Coolidge bill.

One member of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization has been openly informed that opponents of the Kerr-Coolidge bill have made an arrangement whereby every bill reported from the committee will be denied any consideration on the floor of the House unless and until the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization favorably reports some bill to the House providing for the mandatory deportation of all unnaturalized aliens from the United States immediately. One of the Senators from the State of North Carolina, a gentleman for whom I have a high regard, recently held the Senate floor for 4 days in a one-man filibuster against the orderly consideration of the Kerr-Coolidge bill, and while making this filibuster speech stated in part—I quote the Senator: "I wish to state to my distinguished friends in the Senate, I am trying to talk this bill to death."

By means of radio addresses, by printed pamphlets, by letters, telegrams, and petitions sent to the Members of Congress and Senators, and even by speeches in the halls of Congress, the opponents of the Kerr-Coolidge bill are conducting a campaign of vilification, slander, and misrepresentation of facts. The only immediate effect of this un-American campaign is to create a situation among the foreign-born people living in the United States from which this country will be a long time recovering. A reign of terror has been created by the unthinking threats of mandatory and wholesale deportation of all aliens.

Now, for a few moments, let us calmly consider the benefits to be secured by the prompt enactment of the Kerr-Coolidge bill. In the first place, let me say quite frankly that this is the first major legislative proposal in many years, dealing exclusively with aliens subject to the immigration laws who are living within the United States, which has received favorable action by the committees of both the House and the Senate so as to have both the Senate bill and the House bill on the calendars of both Houses of Congress at the same time.

In the second place, let me emphasize the fact that the enactment of the Kerr-Coolidge bill will not enable any alien in any foreign territory to secure admission to the United States, unless that alien is right now entitled to admission under provisions of the immigration laws as they now exist. In the third place, let me assure you that this bill will decrease the number of lawful admissions of aliens, who have never before been in the United States and who seek entry after the enactment of this bill as quota immigrants. This result is obtained in two ways: first, every alien in the United States who is permitted to remain here pursuant to provisions of this bill will be deducted from the quota of the country of which such alien is a native, and so if he remains here he prevents some other native of his country from coming here as a quota immigrant; second, the preference under the quota now enjoyed by skilled agriculturists and their wives and minor children is repealed by this bill, so that hereafter those aliens will only be entitled to come here as quota immigrants without any preference quota, and this will have the effect of keeping most of them out until they can secure a regular quota number.

The enactment of the Kerr-Coolidge bill will not change or repeal the existing provisions of the immigration law requiring the mandatory deportation of alien criminals, anarchists, Communists, violators of the Federal narcotic laws, who are not only narcotic addicts, or persons in the immoral classes subject to deportation. Nor will the bill extend to these classes of aliens any benefits whatever not now enjoyed by them under existing provisions of law.

Four new classes of criminal aliens, who are not now subject to deportation under existing law, are added to the deportable classes. But, because of the drastic provisions created by that law, it is necessary in the public interest to authorize the use of limited discretion as to the actual deportation of aliens in these new deportable classes. Other provisions of the bill will greatly increase the apprehension and detention of aliens thought to be subject to deportation until a proper warrant is issued for their arrest. This will rid our country of some 20,000 criminals.

This will attempt to treat the alien in the noncriminal classes, whose status under the immigration law is questionable while he remains here, as though he were a normal human being, and gives him a chance to have his status adjusted without undue expense or delay, so that he may not be forced to leave his home and fireside in this country. His status will be adjusted so that he will be in a position to proceed under our naturalization laws and eventually become a citizen. The Kerr-Coolidge bill, however, does not grant citizenship, either directly or indirectly, to any alien whatsoever.

One of the major objections expressed by those opposed to the Kerr-Coolidge bill is that it grants discretion to be exercised in certain limited groups of deportation cases. I feel the advocates of the Starnes-Reynolds bill, who oppose the authorized use of discretion under the Kerr-Coolidge bill, are not as sincere as they might be.

My reason for this statement is that in the Starnes-Reynolds bill will be found a vastly more extensive grant to use discretion when it authorizes consular officers abroad, in their judgment, to deny visas to aliens who are unable to pass the consul's intelligence test as to whether or not the applicant for a visa has—and I quote—"intelligence equal to a normal rate of an average sampling of native-born American white stock." In other respects this bill abounds in discretionary features.

I consider one whole portion of the Starnes-Reynolds bill, namely, that portion which seeks to establish permanent fingerprinting records and registry of all aliens in the United States, as a particularly vicious proposal at this time. This proposal, if enacted into law, would definitely establish an alien bloc in the United States on un-American principles. The alien would become a self-conscious member of a group set apart by operation of law from the citizen neighbors in each community and the ready assimilation of such aliens into the United States citizenship would be rendered vastly more difficult than it is under existing provisions of law.

I can think of no more fitting way of closing my remarks than reading to you a little quip from the New York Times entitled "One Good Plan": "One earnest lady would solve the unemployment problem by deporting 7,500,000 aliens and give their jobs to 'Americans.' Actually the results may be even more gratifying than she anticipates. For instance, sending 7,500,000 people out of the country means a great many new jobs in shipping and shipbuilding, and land transportation of all kinds. There will also be hundreds of thousands of new jobs for watchmen to keep an eye on the millions of homes deserted by the deportees. But this is not all. Actually there are fewer than 3,000,000 unnaturalized aliens in the country over the age of 21. If we are to deport 7,500,000 aliens, we shall have to begin by first importing about 4,000,000 of them; and this again means a boom in transportation employment. It may be, of course, that this earnest lady expects to get her 7,500,000 aliens by first depriving all naturalized citizens of their citizenship rights and making them real 'foreigners.' That would create at least a million new clerical jobs. The more you look at the scheme the more wonderful it becomes."

FLOOD CONTROL ON THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3531) to amend the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes", approved May 15, 1928, with House amendments, insist on House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees:

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. GRISWOLD, Mr. RICH, and Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT.

MEDALS TO MEMBERS OF BYRD SECOND ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 209, authorizing the presentation of silver medals to the personnel of the Second Byrd Antarctic Expedition.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, was that handled by any committee; and if so, by what committee?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Naval Affairs Committee. The Senate unanimously passed the bill and it was handled by the Naval Affairs Committee, and it carried no appropriation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and hereby is, directed to cause to be made at the United States Mint such number of silver medals as he may deem appropriate and necessary, respectively, to be presented to the deserving personnel of the Second Byrd Antarctic Expedition that spent the winter night at Little America or who commanded either one of the expedition ships throughout the expedition, to express the high admiration in which the Congress and the American people hold for their heroic and undaunted accomplishments for science, unequalled in the history of polar exploration.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MONOPOLISTIC MOTIVES OF THE CORPORATE CHAINS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN introduced a bill making it unlawful for any person engaged in commerce to discriminate in price or terms of sale between purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality, to prohibit the payment of brokerage or commission under certain conditions, to suppress pseudo-advertising allowances, to provide a presumptive measure of damages in certain cases, and to protect the independent merchant, the public whom he serves, and the manufacturer from whom he buys, from exploitation by unfair competitors.

The Patman bill does not propose to prohibit an entire business, nor even an entire class of transactions. It only imposes certain limits of security upon the transactions to which it relates, within which limits full latitude remains for all sound economic processes and beyond which limits the evils at which this bill is aimed are characteristically found.

Those evils may be summarily stated as the abuse of the large buying power controlled by a few large purchasers to extract from manufacturers and other selling sources, price preferences and discriminatory allowances not justified by any sound economies in the distinctive methods of selling and servicing those customers; allowances which the seller, therefore, cannot afford to grant proportionally to his entire trade, since to do so would reduce his revenues below the reasonable net profit; discriminations, therefore, which the seller can grant only because they are discriminatory; that is, only because they are counterbalanced by sales to other customers at higher prices from which the seller can recoup such part of his reasonable net profit as he loses on sales to the preferred customers, and which he must in the long run recoup somewhere to justify his continuance in business; discriminations, in short, which for these very reasons can be granted to a few only at the expense of the remaining customers of the same seller.

The bill is to help the manufacturer to resist the unfair demands of the large buyer. He grants these demands only under fear of losing the business to some other competitor who will grant them if he does not. The more able he is made to treat all customers alike, the better and more efficiently he can organize and conduct his business, and the more easily can he do business at a profit, and at the same time grant his customers, and through them the public whom he serves, a share in his economies through reductions in prices.

The right of the chain stores and mail-order houses to do business is recognized, and the Patman bill would not destroy them unless they depend for their existence upon unfair concessions and discriminations. So far as they are able to perform the sound, economic function of bringing the necessities and adornments of life from the producer to the consumer on a basis of equality with independent merchants, it leaves them with the same freedom as the independent. But anyone familiar with chain-store buying power and its ruthless use need not be told that the chains are already getting any price differentials supported by differences in cost. The evil lies in the fact that they are getting much more. They are getting concessions, discriminations, rebates, and other differentials representing neither savings to the seller nor service value to the consumer public; and they are getting them only by virtue of their power to bludgeon the manufacturer into granting them under threat of loss of the large business which they are able to control. Insidious methods are sometimes employed to render these tactics still more deadly. Spies are placed or subsidized in banks, in the manufacturer's own offices, or in other quarters of confidential information to learn when his notes are falling due, so that a large offer of business or a threat of its withdrawal, with consequent gain or loss of case resources, may be laid on the manufacturer's doorstep at the critical moment. This bill would protect the manufacturer against such victimization.

The report of the Federal Trade Commission contains interesting information as to the methods of the corporate chains in dealing with manufacturers:

Two of the large chain companies do not place orders with a certain manufacturer because of its refusal to allow brokerage. Another manufacturer reported that it does not sell to two chain companies because they operate commission establishments or buying agencies which demand a brokerage fee on all purchases.

One or two manufacturers, stating that coercion had been employed to force the cutting of prices, said that if the customer has a large order and demands a cut price, the company often is required to meet the demand or lose the business to its competitors. The other stated that the large chains chisel a substantial percentage from the net invoices of every order placed.

One manufacturer reported that some years ago it made extensive sales to a chain, but that the demands of that chain became so excessive that it was forced to stop selling the chain. The chain in question had built up the volume of its purchases to about 40 percent of this manufacturer's output, and then suddenly demanded larger concessions, which the manufacturer was forced to grant or else have its production curtailed to that extent. As a result of this experience the manufacturer built up a trade with small jobbers to avoid being forced to make concessions. Another manufacturer reported that a chain company refused to handle its products unless the chain was given a free-goods allowance. Another manufacturer stated that an arrangement is in effect with one chain company whereby a percentage of net invoice price is rebated. Still another manufacturer was forced to grant concessions to a chain by threat that it would discontinue its purchases and manufacture its own products unless it were granted a preferential price.

Among the evils prevalently found are, first, the grant of quantity discounts exceeding any marginal-cost differences between the customers concerned—that is, unsupported by differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from the differing methods of quantities in which such commodities are to such purchasers sold or delivered; second, the payment of brokerage by the seller to dummy brokerage concerns owned and controlled by large buyers and serving the latter's interest; third, the grant of advertising and similar allowances which are either out of relation to the value of any service or facilities rendered in exchange or which, in any case, result in saddling onto the seller the burden of the preferred customers' advertising cost, whereas his smaller competitors must sustain their own.

It is in these three fields, accordingly, that the Patman bill visits its restrictions; and to them those restrictions are carefully limited, leaving full latitude as follows: First, for differentials in prices or terms wherever they furnish an apt vehicle for the transmission of real comparative economies through the channels of distribution to the ultimate consumer; second, in the payment of brokerage wherever the brokerage function offers a real economic service and where it is paid by the one who really benefits from that service to the one who actually renders it in his behalf; third, in the

use and compensation of all legitimate advertising and advertising services wherever it is really desired as advertising, and not to cloak the grant of a competitive advantage to one customer as against another.

Fifteen years ago chain stores were doing only 4 percent of the retail business of this country. In 1929 chains did 20 percent; by 1933 the ratio had increased to 25. Independents, which did 77 percent of the total business in 1929, accounted for 71 percent in 1933. The sales of independents decreased 53 percent, whereas the sales of chains decreased 35 percent. In 1933 there were 26,000 fewer independent stores than in 1929.

Before the onslaught of big business, 300,000 independent dealers have gone down, and unless the movement toward centralization is checked, 500,000 more are due to follow them. Eight hundred thousand men, each the master of his own store, men who have spent their lives learning merchandising, who know the peculiar needs of their own customers, who love their communities and have given a helping hand in their development, who cherish the institutions of their country because those institutions have enabled the individual man to develop, to grow, and to achieve—these 800,000 masters must become servants, employees of great chain corporations, cogs in a soulless and conscienceless machine, robots of distribution, receiving and obeying orders from the great city, directing them what to sell, how to sell it, and how much to sell it for. That is the prospect that is due to face the American people.

There is no economy in commercial piracy. It may enable a few men to amass a fortune, but to the great mass of the people it spells a total loss. The consumer is best served when he buys his goods from day to day at honest prices, allowing a fair margin of profit on every item, a profit that will enable the manufacturer, the jobber, and the retailer to continue doing business, competing with others in a fair and honorable way. Whenever a manufacturer or a merchant fails as a result of unfair competition, the loss ultimately falls on the consumer. The bankruptcy of many producers and distributors may mean temporary savings for the patrons of bargain counters; but ultimately it results in monopoly for a few producers and distributors, who will charge the public a price limited only by what the market will bear.

We have enacted laws to prevent railroad companies from giving rebates to favored shippers. We require warehouses to charge every man the same price for storing grain and other commodities. We make telephone companies maintain a uniform schedule of rates. We revoke the licenses of insurance companies if they collect different premiums from different policyholders for the same risk.

Why should not the principle of fair dealing which has been adopted for the protection of those who use the railroad for transportation, the warehouse for storing commodities, the telephone for communication, and insurance for protection be extended to protect those who buy merchandise and those who sell it?

We prohibit discrimination because discrimination lifts the burden off a favored group and places it upon the rank and file. We prohibit it because when some pay less than a fair price others pay more. We prohibit it because discrimination is the mother of monopoly, and H. R. 8442, a bill to amend section 2 of the Clayton Act, is aimed at monopolistic motives.

I find no fault with the principle that the fittest should survive, but I protest with all the emphasis I can command against a misinterpretation of that principle which gives advantage, not to the fittest but to the strongest and the craftiest. Civilization puts the emphasis on right rather than on might. The powers of government should be used to make business civilized.

STATE CONVENTION OF YOUNG DEMOCRAT CLUBS AT DAVENPORT, IOWA

Mr. JACOBSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD to include a speech made by my colleague, Mr. WEARIN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBSEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. OTHA D. WEARIN before the State convention of Young Democrat Clubs at Davenport, Iowa, on May 18, 1936:

Mr. Chairman and Young Democrats of Iowa, I am honored and delighted with this opportunity of addressing the State convention of Young Democrat Clubs in my home State. Permit me to congratulate you upon the splendid sessions you have been having here in Davenport. I want to go further than that and say I think this organization represents one of the most powerful factors in the national affairs of the Democratic Party. I say that, not because I am one of your number myself and a member of various of Young Democratic Clubs in my State, but because I really believe what I say.

Before entering upon a discussion of national affairs and the relationship of our group to the important questions of the hour, I want to say that I take particular satisfaction out of speaking in Davenport tonight, located as it is in the Second Congressional District of Iowa, represented in Congress by my able and beloved friend, the Honorable BERNHARD M. JACOBSEN, of Clinton. I will never forget my first meeting with him at Des Moines while I was a member of the Iowa State Legislature, and I recall with satisfaction the many courtesies extended to me by him and his secretary during my first freshman days in Washington and throughout the balance of my service in my present capacity. As you know, Mr. JACOBSEN is a member of the powerful and important Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. His splendid work has brought him the admiration of the leadership and placed him in such a position that he is remarkably influential in our national councils of state.

Again I want to repeat that the invitation to address this splendid group of young men and women of my own age has brought a thrill that one seldom experiences. I have been a candidate for public office for a number of years, and in every instance have felt the powerful influence of the Young Democrats, who have stood by me and fought for me in a splendid manner.

The Nation is fully aware of the influence of the group in campaigns that are past and that are still in the offing. Nothing delights me more than to see members of our group interested in public service and offering themselves at the respective primaries and general elections for public office. Let no one discourage you in your ambitions with the statement that you are still too young. I have been guilty of that so-called damnable crime for a long time but have borne up under its weight without feeling any particular disadvantage from it. If I had the time tonight I would go back, as I sometimes do, and trace the history of world affairs singling out a few of the younger men and women who have participated in important events. I shall say briefly, however, that it is always encouraging for us to remember that Sir William Pitt, one of England's greatest statesmen, was a member of Parliament at 21, Chancellor of the Exchequer at 23, and Prime Minister and practically ruler of all England at 25. Many of the leading founders of this Nation, including Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton, who represented the two schools of political thought of the time, were still in their thirties when the Declaration of Independence was written and the Constitution of the United States in the process of formation. William Jennings Bryan, who probably had a longer reign of influence in Democratic politics and in national affairs than any other man in American history, was nominated for the Presidency the first time when he was 36 years of age. Theodore Roosevelt was in his early forties (I believe 43) when he succeeded to the Presidency the first time. Today the New Deal has recognized a splendid group of young men in positions that range from the heads of important New Deal agencies to assistant secretaries of the respective departments, including my good and able friend, Charles West, of Ohio, at the present time Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

I would call this fact to your attention: That in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives at the present time is a sizable group of young men which, at the beginning of the Seventy-third Congress, to which I was elected, ranged in age from 28 to 40. Very frankly, as I look back over the achievements of the past two sessions and the contributions that have been made to the welfare of the Democratic Party, making allowances for the seniority of the leadership, I am just as well pleased to be a member of that younger group as I would be if I were a member of the older group.

But to get to the business of the evening: There are just a few things I want to bring you tonight in the way of a message from the Capitol. After 4 years, during which the Democratic Party has been in control of every branch of the Government with the exception of the Supreme Court, we have witnessed a startling rise, a phenomenal improvement, in the morale, and the economic condition of the United States. It is unnecessary for me to refer before this well-informed group of young men and women to the condition of the country in 1932 at the time we succeeded to power, with your aid and assistance. I feel that we should not take the time to discuss in detail the bankrupt condition of American agriculture, suffering from 10-cent corn and 2-cent hogs, the desperate state of American banking, the ruined condition of business as a whole,

and the greatest load of unemployment that America has ever carried. Out of that chaotic condition a great President has brought order and progress. At this moment I pay tribute to the great leader of the Democratic Party, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

As I survey the national scene tonight I see a striking change just as you do. I see an improvement in American agriculture that has increased its income from approximately five billions in round numbers to what will probably be in the neighborhood of nine billions this year. I see a restoration of industrial activity which is astonishing. Every day I pick up publications, some of which are hostile to the program, read their vicious and vitriolic editorials, and turn to the business sections to find a series of headlines that read something like this: New building boom forecast by experts; bonds improve on wide front; stock prices advance under market boom; further increase in agricultural income predicted for 1936; steel output best since 1930; automobile sales peak record smashed; oil company net rise for quarter; tobacco industry higher for week, and so on through a long list of similar improvements that cover almost every industrial field of activity.

Now, my friends, in view of the fact that we are young men and women, I feel it might be proper for me to direct my attention a little more to the New Deal of tomorrow rather than the New Deal of today, with which you are just as familiar as I am. Not even the most pessimistic and partisan of our opponents dares to dispute the truth of the headlines I have just quoted to you. You know, as I do, that many factors have entered into securing the results we have sought and gained. The only argument that can be used today is that being promulgated by the vested interests of this Nation in the thought that fear dominates the country as a result of the program. In the first place, can you imagine American business and American people being afraid of the economic improvement that has taken place under the New Deal since 1932? Such a supposition is absurd, but let us pause for a moment and see what the pessimists are afraid of.

A few days ago I met a reactionary on the streets, living in a dreamland of long ago, when personal liberty could be used to the extent of capitalizing upon the very souls of the masses who work for a living with their hands and who form the foundation of America past, present, and future. He told me that American business and the American public are afraid to go ahead because of the acts of the present administration. I said, "What are they afraid of? Are they afraid of having their bank deposits guaranteed up to \$5,000, are they afraid of having their homes saved when private financial institutions fail to save them, are the people of America afraid of having the uncertainty of poverty in old age swept aside with social-security legislation, are they afraid of being protected in their dealings in securities, are they afraid of having their national wealth increased with a program of self-liquidating public works, are they afraid of a power-development program to bring cheap electricity into homes that are warped with drudgery, are they afraid of legislation to prevent the overcapitalization of industry that heretofore has resulted in their being fleeced out of millions of dollars for worthless watered stocks and bonds, are the American farmers afraid of 75-cent corn, \$1.25 wheat, 10-cent hogs, 14-cent cattle, 11-cent cotton, and 18½-cent tobacco, as compared to 9-cent corn, 20-cent wheat, 2-cent hogs, 4-cent cattle, 6½-cent cotton, and 10½-cent tobacco in 1932, are they afraid of having their farms refinanced at a saving of from 1 to 1½ percent; are they afraid of Federal loans on their agricultural products affording them an opportunity to await the arrival of satisfactory market conditions; is anyone afraid to have the unemployed of this Nation fed through the productive agency of the Public Works or Works Progress Administration until such time as American industry becomes sufficiently rehabilitated to absorb them; is either the American public or American business afraid of the generally improved economic conditions since the advent of the New Deal, as evidenced on the market pages of every newspaper in the United States, be it hostile or friendly to the program?"

Out of today always comes another day, and no one is more interested in that prospect than the young Democrats of America. We have advanced this far, now where do we go from here? As I view the national scene today I think there are three important issues in the welfare of this Nation that we must continue to meet and deal with in the future. American industry, including agriculture, in which we of Iowa are so vitally interested, and all lines of business activity in the United States can be traced directly to these three important items. One is the tariff, another is the national attitude toward the question of electric power, and the third is the matter of employment. Now let us pause for a moment to consider: That great idealist and staunch believer in the principles of democracy, Woodrow Wilson, once said with reference to the tariff, that the whole question and its relationship to business reminded him considerably of the man who entered the city of Boston for the first time, that you know is notorious for its winding streets. He approached a party near the station and said, "My friend, I am a stranger here. Can you direct me to the Commons?" The reply was, "Yes; I can. Take any one of these streets going in any direction, follow it, and eventually you will come to the Commons." So it is with American business. It is all closely associated with the question of the tariff. I shall not trace the history of the tendency of the leadership of the Republican Party throughout over half a century to instill in the minds of the American people the necessity of high protection. They, those leaders, were quite successful in doing it on the ground that the standard of living in America must be protected. They even sold the farmers and the laboring men upon digging down into

their jeans to pay the bill to the industrial interests of this country on the theory that they were profiting themselves from the added cost.

The rates of protection rose higher and higher until eventually they reached their climax in that monstrosity known as the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, saddled upon the country during the administration of Herbert Hoover. Because of the terms of that act other countries were led to adopt similar nationalistic policies and to erect retaliatory tariff walls. When America could no longer sell her goods in the face of such opposition she was naturally forced to curtail her industrial production, which she did, with the subsequent result that workmen were thrown out of work by the millions. Their purchasing power thus destroyed was no longer brought to play to absorb agriculture's surpluses that in turn rose higher and higher, and we had the phenomenal condition in America in 1932 of millions of men and women crying for bread, the graineries of the Nation full to overflowing, and the producers of food commodities bankrupt.

We must remember that the United States is a surplus-producing country with reference to all her major agricultural products. Under those circumstances a tariff on such things, which has been used as a sop to convince representatives of agricultural districts to vote for industrial tariffs has been useless. We cannot expect a tariff on such surplus products to have any effect upon the market price except at such times when seasonal shortages might leave the American market with an inadequate supply of its own products. Our only hope for the future of the American farmer is to stimulate our foreign trade to such an extent that it will absorb our surpluses, or else adopt the temporary program of crop limitation as a permanent policy, which is not in harmony with the principles of the Democratic Party and is being used only at the present moment as a stopgap until we can correct such evils as were forced upon us under the Hawley-Smoot Act and similar atrocities.

In my humble judgment, the only way that we can expect permanent and extensive prosperity for American agriculture and for American industry, which has the same capacity to produce surpluses over and above the needs of the American market, is to develop our foreign trade. We cannot do that on a cash basis without absorbing all the financial resources of the world, which would be a disastrous thing. We cannot extend credit as a permanent program without also exhausting that resource, and thus the only other procedure is to stimulate the trade of this Nation with other countries of the world on the basis of exchange.

Now, I know the opponents to this particular program will say that the importation of foreign products into this country by way of exchange will lower the standard of American living, be a detriment to labor, and otherwise complicate our economic program. In the first place, I want to remind you that the most complete economic collapse we have ever witnessed occurred during the administration that preceded this one, and under the provisions of the highest protective law in the history of the United States. I want to remind you that when we cannot continue to do business for cash or credit indefinitely, which is obvious, we must arrange some program of exchange in order to absorb our production of foods and manufactured articles. It is better that we buy some products and keep our factories running and our farms producing than to witness the unemployment and bankruptcy that prevailed in 1932.

I subscribe to the program inaugurated by that great statesman, Cordell Hull, of arranging reciprocal-trade treaties in which an effort is being made to gradually bring down trade barriers and build up the American market in foreign countries. We have agreed to approximately 10 of them with extremely satisfactory results. Let us take for example the island of Cuba. Prior to the erection of trade barriers Cuba absorbed a large quantity of American lard, a basic commodity of this country, but during the course of the operation of the Hawley-Smoot Act that particular trade sank to the infinitesimal quantity of \$818,116 in 1933 as compared to \$3,920,270 in 1931. Under the new program adopted by this administration on September 3, 1934, it is again on the rise and reached \$3,029,913 in 1935. I could go on through other lists of similar improvements of major agricultural products upon which we depend for prosperity, but time will not permit tonight. I can do little more than discuss the principles involved. If we can sell, and I firmly believe we can, surpluses of farm and industrial products to other countries through the agency of negotiated trade treaties in exchange for products that do not constitute the basic source of American prosperity or products that we do not produce at all it should be obvious to any thinking person that the business condition of this country would of necessity improve. If we can sell surpluses of pork, beef, wheat, cotton, tobacco, automobiles, steel, and other major products abroad we will establish a firm prosperity for American business. Farmers will have more money with which to keep the wheels of industry moving and that means work for the unemployed. A good example today is the renewed activity of farm machinery factories during the past 18 months.

Now, I know sometimes the ballyhoo artists like to get on the platform and weep crocodile tears because a boat load of Argentine corn has been delivered at San Francisco or Baltimore, Md. There has been an increase in the last 2 years of imports of Argentine corn, due to what? Due simply to the fact that the drought of the summer of 1934 occasioned a shortage in our own supplies that has not yet been entirely absorbed by our own production. When it has the Argentine will no longer be able to compete with our product, any more than it has in the past. One

of the major reasons for which is the matter of its quality. It is not of such a character that it can be used in commercial activities with the exception of a limited field.

Just at the moment the dairying interests are fearful lest they are going to be destroyed under the terms of the Canadian Treaty. They must remember, however, that the importance of the imports under the terms of that treaty have been greatly magnified. For instance the annual importation of butter from Canada will only amount to one-tenth of 1 percent of the annual amount produced in this country. All of which brings me to this conclusion: The young Democrats of this Nation should be vitally concerned with the continuation of a broad-minded program for trade development in the United States, under the terms of reciprocal-trade treaties enacted by the present administration for the purpose of stimulating our trade with the world. That policy can under the able management of Secretary of State Hull bring about the maximum of activity and, thereby, the employment of men who have been thrown out of work under the program of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act.

The other important question that I desire to bring to the attention of the young Democrats of this convention is the issue of the development of power in the United States, which has become of large concern to the welfare of every man, woman, and child in the Nation.

Investigations of the Federal Trade Commission have revealed the fact that the corporate interests have been guilty of selling millions upon millions of dollars of watered stocks and securities to the American public that have pyramided corporation upon corporation, adding costs in the way of salaries for Hopsons and his kind, interest on securities back of which there was no real value, and other costs that have resulted in the unsuspecting public having to pay excessive rates for their electrical energy which has kept down consumption of the product and denied to untold millions the godsend of relief that comes from having the drudgery of homework, farmwork, and heavy labor lifted from their shoulders by that all-important commodity. In a recent private investigation of my own I found that consumers in our district are paying as much as 18 and 20 cents per kilowatt-hour for electricity. The power companies will dispute that and say that their rates are 4, 6, and 8 cents, but I say the total cost to the consumer is represented by the rate per kilowatt-hour and other charges including service. The Tennessee Valley program has brought electricity to the consumers in that territory at striking reductions. Poor people who could never afford the commodity before are now in a position to use it. I find, for example, that a man in my territory who paid \$5.51 for 40 kilowatt-hours could have bought the same amount of current under the Tennessee Valley program for \$1.20. You can see from this that he could either reduce his total annual charges under such a program to a marked extent or for the same amount of money he could bless his wife and himself with the advantages of other needed conveniences. I selected this single example from a large number in my files because of my lack of time tonight. I say to this assembly of young Democrats that you should have the courage to stand up against the powerful influence of the moneyed interests of the Nation who stoop to any method to intimidate their opponents and fight for the advancement of the power program of this administration that will bring rural electrification and electrification of homes in towns and cities at prices that the people can afford to pay.

As one of the solutions of our problem in Iowa I have offered the United States Congress a Missouri Valley power development project that would be similar to the T. V. A. That great statesman, Senator GEORGE NORRIS, of Nebraska, has offered one for the whole Mississippi Valley which is commendable. The results would be similar to what I described a moment ago with reference to the typical example of a consumer's charges. Until such time as we can achieve that type of project, it will be necessary for us to advance under the Rural Electrification Administration through the agency of cooperative rural lines, made possible through 100-percent loans to such groups. Unfortunately, the Washington set-up of that group has not had the kind of cooperation from the heads of the extension department in Iowa that they should have had. County agents throughout the State have, however, endeavored to cooperate to the best of their ability and with their help the program is advancing. You can expect some of the newspapers of this State to fight me on this program either openly or through a more subtle method of opposing me upon some other issue. If you find such a publication swinging into action against me turn to its advertising section and you will probably find some large, remunerative ads paid for by the power companies. With reference to this issue I will say again to the young Democrats at this convention that it constitutes one of the major programs of the future that will be a godsend to the common people. It is your duty and mine to stand behind Franklin D. Roosevelt and see that it marches forward.

The third major problem which will be with us for years to come as a result of the economic chaos into which we were plunged by the previous administration is the matter of unemployment. Millions of men were out of work when we took control of the Government. Right here and now, I want to say it is unfortunate that we have been forced to spend so many millions to insure them of food and clothing, but what is more unfortunate is the fact that a condition ever existed in this rich Nation that made it necessary for us to spend those millions to keep them from starving and freezing.

We have advanced a program of public works with the thought in mind that in addition to employing the men who were unemployed we could at the same time give to the Nation a constructive series of improvements that would increase the natural wealth and the values of the respective communities. Now the small carping critics who do not have the mental capacity to view this program on a national scale can select some individual project, and it is impossible for so vast a program to be perfect in every respect, and condemn it perhaps with some justification; but we, as young Democrats, should impress upon the public that it is the program as a whole that counts and not a specific mistake that has been made. I used to say to the audiences in our congressional district with reference to it that my wife was, generally speaking, an excellent cook. Once in a while she will make some pancakes for breakfast that are terrible, but I have never divorced her because of that individual mistake and am not going to, because, as I said before, generally speaking she is an excellent cook. That analogy will apply to the whole program about which I am talking at the moment. The entire situation, of course, all traces back to the principal point of my discussion, namely, that the trade of America is of the utmost importance. Through it we hope and have reason to believe that the prosperity of agriculture and industry will be restored. When that time comes the greater portion of the people who are out of employment will again be carrying their dinner pails to work and their wives will be singing happily in their little homes. While we are in the process of working with these major things in the future, and their advancement will rest entirely in the hands of men and women like yourself, of our own age, we will couple with them such other things as contribute to the permanent welfare of the country that I have already mentioned in the way of old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, regulation of stock exchanges and other things for the protection of the general public.

As I look out over this assembly of young men and women I am encouraged. I feel confident after watching the people of my own generation in action in public office that we will be able to meet and cope with these problems and that America, thank God, will continue to live.

THE COMING ELECTION

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including a radio address I gave over a station in Detroit, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WMBC, Detroit, Mich., May 18, 1936:

Next November the people of the United States will be called upon again to make their choice of a President and Congress. We have been told that the coming election is the most important since the election of Lincoln in 1860. This is true. Never since the days of the Civil War have the people of our Nation been faced with issues more fundamental than those presented to us today. We are entering a new age and policies are to be chosen to mark the course we are to follow in the future.

This much we have all learned from the lessons of the post-war decade of reckless and unsound prosperity and the bitter days of depression and privation which followed the collapse of the boom; that no longer can there be permitted in America unbridled exploitation either of natural or material resources or of human beings. We have learned that no longer can we afford to permit eight-tenths of 1 percent of our entire population to receive over 20 percent of the national income, while 60 percent of our families receive less than enough to supply them with the basic necessities of life. We have learned that the problem of unemployment resulting from technological efficiency and from the maturing of our economic system cannot be solved by a refusal to recognize that it exists. We have learned that America as a nation cannot afford to permit her millions of farmers to labor year after year for a return less than the cost of production. We have learned, in short, that there was something radically wrong with the method by which the fruits of our civilization were distributed among our people.

The American people have thought deeply during the past half dozen years, and I am confident that no return to the pre-depression system of inequality, privilege, and exploitation will be permitted. The American people in 1932 demanded and obtained an end to a system that bred insecurity and they will in the coming election again demand that our political parties face the facts of our economic and social life.

What are these facts? Briefly these: We are a Nation providentially provided with all essential material resources and magnificently equipped to produce an abundance of those goods and services which are required for a decent standard of living. So long as millions of our people are in want there is no place in America for idle men or idle factories, for America is technically and materially equipped to produce plenty for all. It is up to us to see that plenty is produced and distributed for the benefit of all the people of the Nation. It is up to the leadership in our Nation, both industrial and governmental, to so order our economic life that opportunity will be maintained for our youth,

jobs for our laborers, adequate prices for our farmers, and security for our aged and those who are physically handicapped.

These are the facts which condition the thinking of our new age. They place upon the political parties of our Nation a grave responsibility, for it is the peculiar function of political parties in a democracy to formulate and define the issues as to choice of policy in order that the electorate may choose wisely. The American people are alert to the significance of the coming election and they are demanding that our parties face the facts and declare their position in positive, clear, and intelligible terms. There must be no equivocation, no weasling, no evasion. Any party that refuses to face our social and economic problems and refuses to give to the people a program for dealing with these problems in a sham and a pretense, a mixture of hypocrisy and cowardice.

I pause to ask the question as to what answer the leaders of the Republican Party have given to the problem of maldistribution of wealth, to the problem of unemployment, the problem of social and economic security? The Republican Party has proposed no positive program. The course of the G. O. P. has been one of negation and of empty criticism of the constructive achievements of the New Deal. The Republican leaders have nothing to offer the Nation except a return to the days of 1929, a return to the conditions of exploitation and insecurity, to those days of growing unemployment, financial debauchery, and depressed agriculture.

The leaders of the G. O. P., subsidized by funds from those who profit by the law of the jungle, have talked much but said nothing of a constructive nature. True, I'll admit, even the Republicans find it difficult to criticize some phases of the New Deal. The Republicans very generally voted in favor of the Social Security Act and the Federal Housing Administration Act. They raise no objection to the C. C. C. program. No fundamental objections has been raised against the policy of soil conservation. Herbert Hoover in one of his recent speeches even went so far as to claim credit for having originated the present farm program. The fact is, of course, that for 12 long years from 1920 to 1932 the leaders of the Republican Party resisted with every means at its disposal the enactment of a farm program that would be of real benefit to the farmers of this Nation. Yes; the Republican leaders now, after the Democratic New Deal has pointed the way, accept the necessity for the protection of our farmers by the National Government.

I could point out numerous instances of our Republican friends who have attempted to capitalize on the popularity of New Deal reforms—our junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], for instance, who speaks in such glowing terms about the New Deal establishment of protection for our bank depositors. I have but one question to ask of these Republican leaders who now recognize that reform in the interest of the people was long overdue in 1932: Why did not they when in power during the first 4 years of the depression take the initiative in proposing the reforms which they now support? The answer is, of course, that the leaders of the G. O. P. are controlled by those who supply the funds for the Republican Party, the bankers of Wall Street, the Du Ponts, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the utility companies, and others of our industrial and banking fraternity. These men wanted no reform, and the G. O. P. was helpless and still is. The trouble with the Republican Party is that it has been dying of sleeping sickness.

The New Deal promised relief for those millions of our people who were brought face to face with starvation by the Hoover depression. That relief was and is being given. The New Deal promised to take steps to set into operation the forces of recovery. This job, too, has been done and better days are at hand. The purchasing power of the people has been raised and factories, mines, and mills long idle are again in operation. I need not in Michigan point out the evidences of our remarkable recovery during the past 3 years.

The income of the farmers of our Nation has been raised by \$2,000,000,000 and the farmers are again buying automobiles. For every 10 automobiles registered in 1932, there are 42 registered today. Automobile production is up by 70 percent in the last 4 years. New plants are being built in many Michigan cities, and for the first time since the Hoover depression factories are running behind in their orders. Employment in the automobile industry is up to 98 percent of what it was in 1929. It is estimated that over 4,500,000 cars will be produced this year, 90 percent of them in Michigan. In a sense, more than three-fourths of the people of the United States travel with their feet on a part of Michigan, for the floors of 90 percent of their cars and the chassis beneath are made in Michigan factories, by Michigan workers, largely from Michigan iron and timber. Increased automobile production has stimulated activity in the iron mines and the lumber industries. We are proud that our great Michigan industry is well back to normal, and as a Democrat I am proud that the New Deal has made possible the reemployment of thousands of men who were without work.

Michigan farmers, too, have come back. During the Hoover panic year of 1932 Michigan farmers received as the total for all livestock and crops produced but \$118,567,000. In 1935, after 3 years of the New Deal, the total cash income for the farmers of our State had increased to \$177,000,000, an increase of almost 50 percent. In 1932 the Michigan farmers were crushed beneath a burden of debt and taxation. Since the Democratic administration came into power, taxes on farm property have declined 60 percent and

foreclosures have dwindled. There is every indication that progress will continue toward full recovery in 1936 with the reelection of that great and glorious leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

One of the outstanding achievements in Michigan has been the increase of alfalfa acreage, in which Michigan now ranks second in the Union, an increase from 75,000 acres in 1919 to 1,000,000 acres in 1935. Michigan ranks second in the production of sugar beets, increasing her acreage 100 percent from 1931 to 1935. Michigan ranks first in the production of field beans, the value of this crop increasing from \$5,363,000 in 1931 to nearly \$10,000,000 in 1935. In potatoes, Michigan took second rank in the Nation in 1935 with a crop valued at \$12,492,000. Before the New Deal in 1931 the potato crop brought Michigan farmers but \$4,331,000. Michigan's cherry crop increased in value from \$608,000 for the Republican panic year of 1932 to \$1,622,000 in 1935. Michigan leads in cherry production; Michigan leads in onion production; and we are the first pickle-producing State in the Union. Does this look like the reduction program that the Republicans cry about? These are the facts that Brucker criticizes. Oh, let him spread the gospel of truth, not lies.

I repeat, Michigan farmers have come back, our acreages have increased, the value of our crops has multiplied, and I submit that the remarkable recovery of our farmers was made possible by the farm program of the New Deal. The junior Senator from Michigan, the Honorable ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, has seen fit to criticize the New Deal farm program. I ask him to explain the recovery of the Michigan farmers. Senator VANDENBERG has stated that the Democratic program has reduced farm production. I ask him to look at the statistics for Michigan. Senator VANDENBERG would like to have the farmers of Michigan go back to the days of 1929, to live again those days of misery and hopelessness. Our junior Senator should hang his head in shame for his picaresque criticism of real achievement. His criticism is a typical Vandenberg vagary.

Sanctity of our courts and freedom of the press, and criticism of the Roosevelt Democratic agricultural program are the main themes of Senator VANDENBERG, who apparently desires to implant in the minds of his hearers that these paladiums of liberty have in some way been endangered by the New Deal in bringing the Nation from the depths of the Hoover panic of 1932 to the present state of well-advanced recovery. The junior Senator from Michigan is an orator of the old school, the very epitome of pomp and circumstance as he paces back and forth upon the Senate floor—a champion full worthy of the pelf and power faction of the Old Guard. Hamilton is his ideal, about whom he has written two books—Hamilton who opposed the farmers and who looked upon the people collectively as a dangerous beast.

What alternative to the program of the Democratic administration which has made possible this recovery do the G. O. P. leaders offer? None. They criticize the New Deal for spending money and unbalancing the Budget. They forget that the Budget became unbalanced under Herbert Hoover, and they forget too that while Mr. Hoover did nothing to remedy conditions, President Roosevelt's administration has brought about an increase in the income of our people from thirty-five billion in the last year of the Hoover administration to sixty-five billion in the present year of Roosevelt recovery. The Budget of the Nation may be out of balance as to emergency expenditures, but the budgets of millions of our people have for the first time since the days of Hoover Republican depression been brought into balance.

Republican leaders charge that the New Deal has regimented the lives of our people, that our traditional liberties are about to be destroyed, that the Constitution has been perverted and democratic institutions imperiled. Our junior Senator, Mr. VANDENBERG, has often put on his best oratorical shows in criticism of this nature. Now, I ask you from what source has come this hue and cry about the loss of liberty? Does the man who has been kept from starvation by a Democratic relief program and now has a job because the Democratic administration has made possible recovery make the complaint? No; of course not. Labor and agriculture have not complained. Those who do complain are those whose unjustified control of the economic life of our Nation has been broken. Few people will see anything pathetic in one of the millionaire Du Ponts crying as to loss of liberty; the people know that to the Du Ponts and others of their breed liberty has meant freedom to exploit our workers and farmers. The Democratic Party is the champion of liberty not for the Du Ponts or the utility companies, but for the great mass of our people. The New Deal has recognized that without a basis in economic security and opportunity there can be no liberty. Economic enslavement under the old deal of the Republicans was an absolute denial of the benefits of civil and political liberty. The New Deal has broken the dominion of the ruling economic class in America and naturally has encountered the wrath and the propaganda of those who would block reform. They speak through their mouthpieces in the Republican Party. They refuse to meet our social and economic problems squarely; and hiding behind the Constitution, they attempt to frighten the people with talk about an unbalanced Budget. The Republican leaders refuse to face the facts, because facing the facts would expose the emptiness of their position.

It is well understood that reform under the New Deal will continue. It is not proposed that America will be remade, but it is proposed that conditions in America will be so ordered that the goal of economic and social security for all will be reached.

The farm program is well under way, and American farmers for the first time since the World War can feel secure. The

problems of labor have not been so completely solved. Technical efficiency in industry is constantly making necessary the employment of fewer and fewer men. It is estimated that industrial production has advanced 51 percent since January 1, 1933, yet unemployment has decreased but 30 percent. This means simply that to produce the same volume of goods today, fewer men are needed than were employed in 1933. Now it stands to reason that unless the worker's buying power keeps pace with the volume of production we cannot prosper. Our men must be given jobs, and it shall not be by scrapping the efficiency of the machine production. We cannot expect America to continue as a Nation with ten or more millions of our men unemployed. These men are red-blooded Americans with the same birthright as other American citizens. They must be given an opportunity to provide for themselves and their families. Among the rights of the workers is that paramount right to a job, and this right must and shall come before the right of privileged wealth.

Two proposals, mutually dependent, present themselves for our consideration. First, the income of our people must be raised so that a greater volume of goods can be purchased; and secondly, this increase in purchasing power can be best obtained by the employment of all of our people at adequate wages. This program entails a shorter workweek for the major industries with no decrease in wages, and perhaps with some raising of wages. It means the elimination of child labor. It means the giving of opportunity for vocational and higher education to our youth for a longer period than is now possible for most of the young people. This program means the elimination of the sweatshop and of starvation wages. It means the establishment of minimum-wage standards. It may mean a decrease in the rate of dividends and interest for a few corporations, but it will mean a greater security and a more abundant life for the millions of our workers and farmers. This program means the organization of labor into unions of their own choosing for the purposes of collective bargaining. It means the establishment of unemployment insurance, and I might say incidentally that our Republican Governor Fitzgerald has not seen fit to have the great industrial State of Michigan enact a law that will bring our workers within the scope of the New Deal Unemployment Insurance Act.

We need a Democratic Governor and a Democratic administration in the State of Michigan to properly institute and administer that program in sympathy with the national law and the New Deal.

Such a program means the establishment of old-age assistance for those workers who reach an advanced age. A beginning has been made in this program through the Railroad Retirement Act for the railway workers and through the Social Security Act for the people generally. The present old-age assistance program calls for Federal-State cooperation, the Federal Government matching the dollars paid by the States. The Federal Government has left the formulation of rules as to who should be eligible for assistance very largely to the States. I am sorry to state that our Republican administration, led by Gov. Frank D. Fitzgerald, has not given the State of Michigan nor the aged workers of Michigan an adequate old-age-pension law. Eligibility rules for qualification for assistance under the present law in Michigan make necessary in effect a pauper's oath. Small property holdings are to be turned over to the State. The amounts paid are pitifully inadequate. Now, it is recognized that Utopia cannot be gained solely through old-age-security legislation. But the right kind of old-age assistance can go far toward giving to our aged some recompense for a lifetime of toil and hardship. We must not treat those who have become old as if they deserved no consideration. Those workers who are old today made possible with the work of their hands and brains the efficiency of our society today. They must not be forsaken in the twilight of their lives. They must and shall be taken care of adequately and decently. The Michigan old-age-pension law must not above all require a pauper's oath, and it must not keep the aged on the verge of starvation.

Governor Fitzgerald's administration has failed, and I call on the voters of Michigan to cast their ballots next November for the party that has sponsored and begun our old-age-assistance program. That party is the party of President Roosevelt. Some Republican leaders of Michigan have of late been talking much about old-age assistance. I wonder why these gentlemen did nothing about the problem before 1932, when they had control of the National and State Government. The answer is, of course, that these gentlemen resisted reform as long as possible, and I submit that they are not fit persons to undertake the administration and development of a program to which fundamentally they are opposed and which they accept now only because it has become inevitable.

The issues facing us today have broken across traditional party lines. Under the leadership of President Roosevelt, the liberals have gathered in a final march against the forces of privileged wealth and power. Once again the forces of reaction using the Republican Party as their vehicle are throwing their resources into an effort to block reform. The coming election is clearly a battle between the rights of the people on the one side and the privileges of wealth on the other. Our fight is a fight for social justice, a fight for freedom of opportunity for the people of America, and the voters of Michigan must elect men to the Congress of the United States who are men of honor, independence, courage, and honesty.

This Nation does not want dictatorship, and it will not have dictatorship so long as the Representatives in Congress are free and honorable men. All too often we have had men in Congress

who have jumped at the crack of somebody's whip. No Representative can be worthy of the trust of the people who submits to the dictation of any selfish group, organization, or individual. He must be a man who will stand on and be bound by the principles of justice and equity as he sees them. Social justice will be obtained in this country only by maintaining the freedom of government, freedom of expression, and freedom of the ballot box. Democratic institutions will perish in America only when the representatives of the people are controlled by individuals or organizations, political or economic, and lose their identity as free agents to carry out the will of the people.

Founded in American tradition by those men and women who braved the wilderness and established our civilization is the precept that America shall always be a haven for the poor and oppressed, a land of opportunity where one may labor in security. The pioneers of America began the quest for social justice over a century ago. In our complex industrial age we must, in the spirit of the pioneer, continue their struggle until at last we have achieved a nation in which poverty and want are unknown.

GEN. CLARENCE R. EDWARDS

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including a speech delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] at the dedication of the Gen. Clarence R. Edwards Bridge, between Lynn and Revere, Mass., on May 17, 1936:

I deem it an honor and a privilege, today, to be chosen by my own Yankee Division comrades to pay my humble tribute to the "Daddy" of the Twenty-sixth Division, American Expeditionary Forces, Maj. Gen. Clarence Ransom Edwards.

On April 20, 1936, I introduced in the House of Representatives House Joint Resolution 570. The resolution reads as follows: "Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to award posthumously in the name of Congress a Distinguished Service Medal to Maj. Gen. Clarence Ransom Edwards, who died February 14, 1931, after having organized the Twenty-sixth Division and commanded it with distinction during all but 18 days of its active service at the front. The high qualities of leadership and unflinching devotion to duty displayed by him were responsible for the marked esprit and morale of his command. To his marked tactical ability and energy are largely due the brilliant successes achieved by the Twenty-sixth National Guard Division during its operations against the enemy from February 4, 1918, to November 11, 1918."

The foregoing House joint resolution was reported favorably to the House by the House Military Affairs Committee on May 13, 1936, and I confidently expect it to become a law within the next few weeks.

The official record of the military service of General Edwards, as given by the War Department, is as follows:

"Clarence Ransom Edwards: Born in Cleveland, Ohio, January 1, 1859. Appointed from Ohio. Cadet, United States Military Academy, September 1, 1879. Second lieutenant, Twenty-third Infantry, June 13, 1883. First lieutenant, First Infantry, February 25, 1891. Transferred to Twenty-third Infantry, July 20, 1891. Major, Assistant Adjutant General, Volunteers, accepted (to rank from May 12, 1898) May 28, 1898. Vacated, October 1, 1899. Captain, Twenty-third Infantry, July 30, 1899. Assigned to Tenth Infantry, January 1, 1899. Lieutenant colonel, Forty-seventh United States Volunteer Infantry, Volunteers, accepted (to rank from May 12, 1899), October 1, 1899. Mustered out of Volunteer Service, July 2, 1901. Brigadier general, Chief, Bureau of Insular Affairs, accepted (to rank from June 30, 1906) July 2, 1906. Reappointed brigadier general, Chief, Bureau of Insular Affairs, June 30, 1910. Brigadier general (to rank from May 12, 1912), August 24, 1912. Major general, National Army, accepted (to rank from Aug. 5, 1917), August 22, 1917. Honorably discharged, major general, National Army, only, June 31, 1920. Major general (to rank from Mar. 5, 1921), April 27, 1921. Retired from active service, December 1, 1922. A. M., St. John's College, New York, 1891; LL. D., Middlebury College, Vermont, 1919; LL. D., Trinity College, Connecticut, 1919; LL. B., Syracuse University, 1920.

"SERVICE"

"He served with his regiment at Fort Union, N. Mex., from September 30, 1883, to June 2, 1884; en route to and at Fort Porter, N. Y., to August 29, 1884; commanding the guard at the grave of President Garfield, Cleveland, Ohio, to July 1, 1886; at Fort Porter, N. Y., to (on leave of absence June 11 to Oct. 9, 1889) May 10, 1890; while at Fort Porter he served as post adjutant and treasurer in addition to his other duties. On duty at Fort Davis, Tex., post adjutant and range officer to December 15, 1890; professor of military science and tactics at St. John's College, Fordham, N. Y., to October 31, 1893; on duty in The Adjutant General's Office, Washington (M. I. D.), to November 1, 1895; garrison duty at Fort Clark, Tex., commanding Company H, Twenty-third Infantry, in charge of post exchange and of post gardens, also post treasurer to August 27, 1896; quartermaster, Twenty-third

Infantry, commissary and ordnance officer to April 12, 1898; at New Orleans, La., regimental quartermaster, and ordnance officer, and acting adjutant general of provisional division, organized at that place to (resigned as regimental quartermaster May 12, 1898) May 23, 1898; adjutant general, Fourth Army Corps, at Mobile, Ala., Tampa, Fla., and Huntsville, Ala. (also mustering officer, Fourth Army Corps, from July 26 to Aug. 14, 1898), from May 25 to September 15, 1898; on sick leave of absence to December 4, 1898; adjutant general, Fourth Army Corps, to January 4, 1899, when he was ordered to report as adjutant general of the Department of Habana, Cuba; while en route to Habana, Cuba, via Washington, D. C., he was assigned to duty as adjutant general on the staff of Major General Lawton January 6, 1899.

"Although lieutenant colonel of the Forty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, he never served with that regiment, having been on the staff of General Lawton up to the time of the latter's death, December 1899. Relieved December 18, 1899, and accompanied remains of General Lawton to San Francisco by transport, thence by rail to Washington, D. C., and on duty in the office of the Secretary of War as Chief of Division of Customs and Insular Affairs from February 12, 1900.

"While in the Philippine Islands he served in the following operations: General Lawton's Santa Cruz campaign; battle of Santa Cruz, April 9 and 10; battle of Pagsanjan, April 11, 1899; and minor engagements a few miles up the river from Pagsanjan, where, in command of a battalion of the First North Dakotas, he recovered four steam launches held by the insurgents; battle of Pacte, April 12, 1899.

"General Lawton's San Isidro campaigns; battle of Novaliches, September 22, 1899; first battle of San Rafael, April 29, 1899; second battle of San Rafael, May 1, 1899; battle of Balinag, May 2, 1899; battle of San Isidro, May 17, 1899.

"General Lawton's expedition to Province of Morong, June 2 to 8, 1899; battle of Cainta, June 3, 1899; engagement at Taytay, June 4, 1899.

"General Lawton's expedition to Province of Cavite, June 10 to 20, 1899; battle of Guadalupe Ridge on the advance from San Pedro Macati to the east or rear of Parangue; also engagement opposite Las Pinas, June 10, 1899; battle of the Zapote River, June 12, 1899; repelling attack of insurgents, extending from Imus down the river, enveloping Bacoor, October 2 and 3, 1899; repelling second vigorous attack of insurgents on same lines, which finally resulted in our forces driving off insurgents, pursuing them to and through Binacayan.

"On duty in the office of the Secretary of War, as Chief of Division of Customs and Insular Affairs from February 12, 1900, to July 1, 1902; colonel, Chief of Bureau of Insular Affairs, Washington, D. C., to June 30, 1906; and brigadier general, Chief of Bureau of Insular Affairs, to August 24, 1908.

"Commanding the post of Fort D. A. Russell, Wyo., from October 3, 1912, to February 26, 1913; commanding a brigade on the Mexican border to January 1914; en route to Hawaii and commanding brigade to December 14, 1914; en route to the United States to December 14, 1914, and to the Canal Zone to January 6, 1915; commanding the troops in the Canal Zone to April 16, 1917; in and en route to and from the United States January 31 to March 15, 1916; en route to the United States to April 23, 1917.

"He was commanding the Northeastern Department, with headquarters at Boston, Mass., May 1 to August 1917; commanding the Twenty-sixth Division at Boston, Mass., from August 22 to October 11, 1917. Rejoined the division in France November 11, 1917, and was commanding that division in France to October 24, 1918, except from November 25 to November 30, 1917.

"He participated in the following major operations: Champagne-Marne, Aisne-Marne, St. Mihiel, and Meuse-Argonne offensives.

"En route to the United States from November 5 to 14, 1918; on leave of absence to December 1, 1918; commanding the Northeastern Department, Boston, Mass., to August 31, 1920; commanding the Second Brigade, Camp Taylor, Ky., to September 8, 1920; commanding the Second Infantry Brigade, Camp Dix, N. J., to July 1, 1921; commanding the First Corps Area, Boston, Mass., to the date of his retirement.

"He was awarded three silver star citations for gallantry in action against insurgent forces at (1) Santa Cruz, Luzon, Philippine Islands, April 10, 1899; (2) San Rafael, Luzon, Philippine Islands, May 1, 1899; (3) near Guadalupe Ridge, Luzon, Philippine Islands, June 10, 1899.

"General Edwards received the following foreign awards: French Croix de Guerre with Palm; French Legion of Honor, Commander; Belgian Order of Leopold, Commander; Polish Order of Haller's Swords, Chevalier.

"General Edwards died February 14, 1931, at Boston, Mass.

"By authority of the Secretary of War:

"E. T. CONLEY,
"Major General,
"The Adjutant General."

Col. O. L. Spaulding, Chief of the Historical Section of the Army War College at Washington, at my request, has given me the following information concerning the Twenty-sixth Division as to the number of days spent at the front and in foreign service:

APRIL 2, 1936.

HON. WILLIAM P. CONNERY, JR.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONNERY: In response to your telephonic request for information I furnish the following statistics as regards the four significant divisions concerned: Total time in foreign service,

1 year 7 months 2 days; total time at front, 193 days, 148 in quiet sector, 45 days in major operations and active sectors.

The above statistics were compiled from The War With Germany, by Col. L. P. Ayers; the Order of Battle of United States Land Forces in World War, A. E. F., compiled by the Historical Section, Army War College, and Division History Charts, compiled by the G-3 Section of the General Staff, G. H. Q., A. E. F.

I trust that this information will be of service to you.

Very truly yours,

OLIVER L. SPAULDING,
Colonel, Field Artillery,
Chief, Historical Section, Army War College.

It may be interesting to some of my listeners to know just what the words "quiet sector" in the foregoing report meant as pertains to the Twenty-sixth Division:

The laconic bulletins sent out daily to the War Department by the Commander-in-Chief, General Pershing, concerning the division, are also interesting as throwing light on life in a "quiet sector." Following are examples from the communiques of June:

"June 1, 1918, Twenty-sixth Division. May 31 to June 1, noon to noon. General impression quiet. Total of hostile shells, 1,060. Enemy apparently using a 15-centimeter heavy field howitzer.

"June 16, 1918. Twenty-sixth Division, June 13 to June 14, noon to noon; there was little activity of any description. The hostile batteries used about 1,000 shells of which 250 contained gas. The enemy planes were fairly active, a total of 21 being seen. Of these, 13 were within our territory. Our patrols were very active and on several occasions drew rifle and grenade fire from the hostile trenches.

"June 23, 1918, Twenty-sixth Division. June 20 to 21, noon to noon; hostile artillery still active, but less so than during last few days. Intermittent shelling of the entire sector throughout afternoon and evening with heaviest fire concentrated on right and center. On the left, Xivray bombarded with high explosives and gas. Total number of shells used, 1,800.

"June 24, 1918: Twenty-sixth Division, June 21 to 22, noon to noon; the day quiet except for a rather heavy harassing fire executed by the hostile batteries. A total of 1,450 rounds, mostly small caliber, including a little gas, were used by the enemy. The fire was distributed over most of the sector.

"June 26, 1918: Twenty-sixth Division, daily average 1,800 rounds. Maximum for 1 day 6,000 rounds, fired on June 19. Minimum for 1 day 300 rounds, fired on June 21."

The official records of the War Department disclose the fact that 1,730 men were killed in action and 10,568 men were wounded while serving in the Yankee Division during the World War.

"Arriving in the autumn of 1917 the division went through the prescribed course of instruction until early in 1918, when, brigaded with the French, it entered the line for a month and a half's further training north of Soissons, in the Chemin des Dames sector. It was withdrawn for rest when the German offensive of March 21 necessitated its immediate return to the line in the La Reine and Boucq sectors, north of Toul. Here it had two important engagements—one in the Apremont Forest, where it repulsed with loss a heavy German raid, and at Seicheprey, where casualties on both sides amounted to approximately 2,000 men.

"On July 18 the division was thrown into the battle between the Aisne and the Marne, advancing in 7 days more than 17 kilometers against determined enemy opposition and capturing the towns of Epièdes, Trugny, Torcey, Belleau, and Givry.

"It next took part in the American offensive of September at St. Mihiel. Operating under the Fifth Corps in the Rupt and Troyon sectors, north of St. Mihiel, it captured Bois-des-Eparages, Hattonchatel, and Vigneulles.

"Later, during the Meuse-Argonne offensive, it attacked north-east of Verdun and aided in the storming of Etrayès Ridge, capturing Bois-de-Belleu and the Bois d'Ormont, one of the most formidable heights in that region. The division was in this sector when the armistice called a halt to active operations."

General Pershing in the foregoing letter neglected to mention Flirey and Xivray in the Toul sector, while in that sector it was an interesting fact that the enemy attacked each individual infantry regiment of the division at separate places and were repulsed in each engagement. They attacked the One Hundred and First at Flirey, the One Hundred and Second at Seicheprey, the One Hundred and Third at Xivray, and the One Hundred and Fourth at Apremont. In all of these engagements the One Hundred and First, One Hundred and Second, and One Hundred and Third Artillery played magnificent parts in smashing the enemy attacks.

On all of the fronts where the division was engaged the separate units of Engineers, supply trains, machine-gun battalions, Signal Corps, and liaison detachments served their beloved division with zeal, untrifling energy, and heroism.

At Humes, on Christmas Day 1918, President Wilson visited the division and reviewed detachments of it.

The general impression made by the troops on this occasion may best be summarized by the telegram of the Commander in Chief to General Hale:

G. H. Q., December 26, 1918.

C. G., TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION:

I desire to congratulate the division on the excellent work of the battalion which represented it as the guard of honor at Chaumont, on the fine appearance and discipline manifested by the men during the visit of the President of the United States to the billets of the division, and on the splendid appearance made by

the detachments representing the division in the review for the President at Humes, France, December 25, 1918.

PERSHING.

We had only been in the trenches in the Chemin des Dames sector a short time when General de Mard'huy, in whose French Army Corps we were serving at that time, issued a general order.

The letter of compliment from the French corps commander, the first to be received by the division, conveyed under its official phrases a very real and personal affectionate regard. Too much emphasis cannot be placed on the mutual cordiality and esteem which from the very beginning marked the relations of the division's officers and men with their French associates. The letter follows:

ELEVENTH ARMY CORPS,
STAFF HEADQUARTERS,
March 15, 1918.

GENERAL ORDERS, No. 7

We regret that our comrades of the Twenty-sixth Division should leave us in order to fulfill their tasks elsewhere.

We have been able to appreciate their bravery, their sense of duty and discipline, also their frank comradeship; they carry away our unanimous regrets.

General Edwards has been pleased to consider the Eleventh Corps as godfather to the Twenty-sixth Division. The Eleventh Corps feels proud of the awarded honor, being sure that, wherever he may be sent, the godson shall do credit to the godfather.

GENERAL DE MAUD'HUY,
Commanding Eleventh Army Corps.

In September 1918 came the St. Mihiel drive, in which the salient was reduced and the line straightened out. This was the action in which the division captured Bois de Eperges, Hattonchatel, and Vigneulles.

In connection with the part the Twenty-sixth Division took in the capture of Hattonchatel the following tribute was paid by the French corps commander:

"From: General Claude, commanding the Seventeenth Army Corps.

"To: The commanding general, Twenty-sixth Division.

"General, the reputation of your division preceded it here far ahead.

"To all its titles of glory gained in fierce struggles, and only recently at the signal victory of Hattonchatel, it has added on the 23d of October a page which perhaps is more modest, but still does it great honor.

"In a few hours, as at a maneuver, it has gained all the objectives assigned it in the difficult sector of the Woods of Houppy, Etrayès, and Belleau.

"This operation is evidence, indeed, of superior instruction, mobility, and will.

"I do not know how to thank you sufficiently for your assistance, dear General, and it is my great desire to express to you all our grateful admiration for your splendid division which thus has added its name to all of those who have fought to hurl the enemy back from the outskirts of Verdun."

"It is not my intention to recount in detail the thousands of incidents of heroism of officers and men of the division. History will store up some of these glorious deeds for future generations to read. The men who were there on the field of battle know the story of unsung heroes whose names never will be mentioned. Many YD men here within the sound of my voice should be wearing upon their breasts Congressional Medals of Honor or Distinguished Service Crosses, yet their reward must be only the serene, complete content of knowing that they had served their country even far beyond the path of line of duty in battle, that they had performed heroic acts of which the world knows nothing, but in which they and their buddies who were there with them will glory while they live. They can look at the beautiful flag of the United States flying in the breeze with its gorgeous red and its pure white stripes, its deep field of blue, and its bright stars, too, and let their souls cry out, "You're my flag, you're particularly, specially my flag! I fought for you, I proved that I would die for you. I proved it to myself and to my country, and how I love you and what you represent—freedom, liberty, home, and loved ones."

That must be their reward and that reward is sufficient unto them because they are soldiers, soldiers in peace as well as in war.

Our dead rest peacefully in France, and in the hallowed resting places on our own dear soil.

We the living gather here today from the farthest corners of New England; yes, and from far-distant States of the Union. We come not only to honor our dead chief, but to proclaim to the Nation and to the world that we will fight in time of peace as we did in war to safeguard forever the patriotic principles so clearly defined by Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, and the founders of the Republic in the greatest document ever written for the government of a people, the Constitution of the United States.

This dedication today is our answer to communism. As long as one of us lives we will resist any attempt on the part of anyone to overturn by force the Government of the United States, which has been perpetuated and sanctified by the blood of heroes of all our wars.

We pray for peace but we have no sympathy, and can have little respect for, the man or woman who lives under the protection of our American institutions and who will take all the

benefits of that protection and then refuse to take up arms to defend our country in time of need.

The Yankee Division is an American division. The men of the Yankee Division are Americans, and we recognize but one flag, the Stars and Stripes.

General Edwards, "Daddy" Edwards, the "Old Man", the "Idol of the Yankee Division", soldier, brother, father, comrade, all in one, stern in discipline, lover of wit and humor, proud of his outfit, proud of his officers, but most of all, prouder of—defender and champion of—the enlisted man.

He was relieved of his command because he insisted on casting diplomacy aside and, in biting, sarcastic words, told the "higher ups" that he would be no part of a scheme which would aggrandize self-seeking, would-be military leaders, to be brought about by the degradation of officers and men who had followed him unhesitatingly into the hell of battle and men who had already handed on to posterity another golden page of glorious deeds to be placed in New England's book of chivalrous sons, a book teeming with pages of self-sacrifice, honor, patriotism, and fighting fortitude continuing on and on, beginning with the foundation of the United States of America.

The excuse given to relieve him of his command was that Secretary of War Baker, when he was visiting the A. E. F. in France, had suggested that a certain number of divisional commanders who had led combat divisions in battle should be sent back to the United States to train new divisions. Perhaps this would have been done later with other commanders in addition to General Edwards, but as the armistice came shortly after he was relieved one shall never know the answer to that.

The general took his relief as a soldier. Let us see:

The final leave taking of General Edwards on October 26, 1918, was described by Dr. Morton Prince, of Boston, in a letter to Governor McCall of Massachusetts. He said, in part:

"I arrived at divisional P. C. (the advanced post of command during battle) just as the commanding general was transferring his command to his successor, an able officer of experience, who surely will lead the Yankee Division to further victories. Headquarters was a picturesque group of dugouts arranged in two rows, facing one another along an alley camouflaged overhead with boughs of leaves from enemy airplanes.

"In the commanding general's dugout were high officers and members of his staff, while in the alley were grouped other staff officers and headquarters troops. It was but natural and pardonable that depression and gloom were depicted on the faces of all, and that they should speak in subdued voices.

"Though anxious to give the same loyalty to their new commander, they could, for the moment, think only of the past. They were losing their chief to whom they owed everything, and whom they had followed during 9 months of constant fighting.

"The departing general was the only cheery one of the lot. Whatever he may have felt when leaving the soldiers he loved and who loved him, he did not betray, nor did he give the least sign of his private sorrows, for sudden news had just brought grief into his heart in the death of two that were very near to him—his own daughter, and an aide who was like an own son. This we all know. But private grief was not allowed to weigh with duty. He was a soldier through and through.

"A few routine details had to be finished, papers had to be signed. Then came the presentation of his staff to the new commander, with a generous word of commendation for each; a word of good-bye and a grasp of the hand with one another; the same with a kind word to each enlisted man at headquarters; then he sprang into the motor car. At his invitation: I was privileged to accompany him, and with a wave of his hand and a last cheery good-bye we were off, leaving sad faces behind us.

"The next day after a night at the main working headquarters a final good-bye was said by the remainder of the staff, and as we turned back from where the departing motor left us we heard the explosion of a great 14-inch shell that dropped its fragments close to the car as it sped away, as if the German in a last vain effort sought to destroy, in impotent rage, the man who had beaten them on many a field, and there came to us from a distance the cheers of the soldiers wishing their general God-speed.

"There is not a soldier or officer in the division that does not take the general's departure as a personal loss."

Thus does Dr. Prince in fitting language describe the feelings of all YD men toward their commander.

General Edwards was a West Pointer. He had all of the virtues inculcated into the youth of our land who graduate from Uncle Sam's Military Academy. Yet he escaped what many West Pointers did not escape—that false sense of caste and antagonism toward the National Guard and National Army which at times exhibited itself so strongly in our Army during the war.

He rather followed the rule of the generals of France who were firm disciplinarians yet could see no sense in the signs invariably displayed in all American camps, barracks, and posted in cafes and restaurants, "For officers only."

He combined fine gentlemanly instinct with a rare sense of the fitness of things. His humor was contagious. His courage unquestioned. He was a man's man. He loved his men. His men idolized him.

I have searched the records of the War Department and nowhere in the record of his private life and military service can one blot be found upon his escutcheon.

We Yankee Division men who live in this beautiful section of Massachusetts are proud, and justly so, of the action of our Governor and our legislature in naming this bridge the General Clarence R. Edwards Bridge. It will be an ever-present reminder to

us, to our children, and our children's children, of the great deeds of a great man, the leader of a great fighting Yankee Division, the man who put a soul into that division, the man who alive captured the imagination of 40,000 soldiers, the man who dead holds their undying, eternal loyalty and love. General Edwards, today, in the name of all of your living stout-hearted fighting Yankee Division men, in the name of all of our comrades who have gone to the Great Beyond, we salute you.

TWO LETTERS ON MATTERS OF PUBLIC CONCERN

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including copies of two letters I have written on matters of public concern.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GUFFEY COAL BILL

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me with regard to the Guffey coal bill:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 26, 1936.

Mr. D. D. PEDEN,

President, Peden Iron & Steel Co., Houston, Tex.

DEAR DEE: Your wire of 25th to hand and noted.

I have not yet read the new Guffey bill. I note that you ask me to vote against it.

I voted for the other one, and if this one keeps the greedy fingers of the coal operators off the necks of 450,000 coal miners who are shamefully used, oppressed, mistreated, as the other Guffey bill did, I shall vote for it. It is far better, far more American, far more human for those coal-mine workers (450,000 of them—meaning 3,000,000 men, women, and children) to have proper working hours, working conditions, and pay than for extra, extra dividends to be collected at their expense by the inhuman and greedy coal corporations of Pennsylvania and other coal States. Besides the humanities involved, purchasing power which makes for universal prosperity is gained by treating workers right.

I shall, as usual, give this bill careful study when or if it comes up, and vote for it or against it on these principles. I will never confiscate or overtax or punish capital, but I will not by my vote allow the chiselers in industry (like these greedy coal companies) to starve, wreck, and oppress men, women, and children merely to send bigger and bigger extra dividends up to Wall Street.

There are both capital and labor: each indispensably necessary to industry and prosperity. Each such bill must be considered and enacted in the light of doing right by both capital and labor. Of course, all of this big industry in the Pennsylvania and New York section tries to use its relations with all of its business connections throughout the country to ask all Congressmen to vote as these vast and selfish corporations desire in order that they may enslave their workers again as before the present regime, and I hope you yourself will give study to the very matter you lay before me. With me the welfare and justice to men and women who toil comes before extra big dividends to the chiseling portion of big business and industry up here in the East which considers men as natural serfs.

As requested, this new Guffey bill will have the best study, thought, and decision of which I am capable, when it comes up, but I shall be guided by the above sentiments, facts, and views.

With personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

JOE H. EAGLE.

S. 3822: RESALES PRICE—H. R. 8442: CHAIN STORES

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1936.

Dr. W. J. DANFORTH,

Plaza Hotel, San Antonio, Tex.

DEAR DR. DANFORTH: I received today your interesting and welcome letter of January 25, and have read and considered it with care.

(1) I am familiar with the bill originally introduced for Senator TYDINGS as S. 3518 on January 6 of this year, and later introduced by Senator TYDINGS as S. 3822 on January 16. I favor that bill and will support it. In substance it merely is a measure to promote national fair trade. Dumping and price cutting are of no permanent value to any class but a constant menace and injury to all classes. The measure will not prevent fair competition because that will be maintained by the manufacturers. When a retail merchant cuts prices it is merely a dumping process. It breaks the uniform standard of prices. What he loses in such transactions he makes up by adding to the sales price of another article. For this reason the buying public never achieves advantage through cut-price purchases. Therefore, I regard that the bill, S. 3822, is fair to manufacturer, jobber, retailer, and the public.

(2) I am heartily backing the Patman bill, H. R. 8442, to amend section 2 of the Clayton Antitrust Act. I am familiar with the

details of that bill, and I think it will accomplish what it is designed for, that is, to protect the independent merchant and the public as buyers as well as the manufacturer from exploitation by chain-store competitors. The small independent merchant has a perfect right to demand the same opportunity to make a living as the largest chain enjoys. Yet by the methods employed in purchasing by the chains, the small man is denied equality of opportunity. The wealth of chains enables them to buy on their own terms and practically at their own prices, and also enables them to sell at far below cost at any place where necessary to bankrupt their independent competitor. The independent man must be by law guaranteed the right to the same prices and terms and discounts any manufacturer accords to any chain if the small man is to live in business at all. After a chain destroys the independent merchant it will have no competition and can exploit the public by prices at its pleasure. It is therefore in the interest of the public, as well as to safeguard the legitimate rights of the independent small businessman, that the chain groups be not allowed by virtue of their strength and what they can do by their tremendous buying power to put the independent out of business.

This bill (H. R. 8442) makes it unlawful for any person engaged in commerce to discriminate in price or in terms of sale between the chain-store groups and the individual merchant as to like grade and quality; and also prohibits rebates to the chain under pretense of paying commissions and brokerage to their dummies; and the same as to pretended advertising allowances. And it is sound in providing for a presumptive measure of damages for its violation, because such damages to an independent by these unfair chain methods while known to that merchant to ruin him gradually is still difficult to prove, hence the bill properly provides for a presumptive measure of damages in certain cases.

As far back as 1914, when I was then a Member of Congress, I supported and voted for the Clayton Antitrust Act. I approved our work then and approve it now in that act so far as it went; but it has not gone, and I think is not capable of going, far enough to protect against the calamity of this new giant chain-store plan which is ruining small businessmen, and hence I will find deep satisfaction in helping to enact H. R. 8442 to strengthen rather than weaken the Clayton Antitrust Act.

With highest considerations, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOE H. EAGLE.

AMERICA, THE HAVEN OF LIBERTY-SEEKING IMMIGRANTS

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including my own speech delivered on the floor of this House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the speech which I delivered on the floor of the House a number of years ago.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, comets were regarded in ancient times as presages of evil, forecasting the death of kings and the destruction of nations. Edmund Halley, an English astronomer, the friend of the great Newton, observing the comet of 1682, checked back on previous appearances of comets and decided that this comet had a definite orbit about the sun covering 75 years, and predicted the return of this comet in 1737. His forecast was derided, but when 1737 came in the course of time Halley's comet appeared again, and has since that time made its route according to the schedule of Halley. Its latest appearance was in 1910. Superstition faded before knowledge and understanding.

Depressions and panics seem to have cyclic orbits, and with them also seem to come cycles of bigotry and persecution, as if both were parts of some cosmic disturbance. Like the lag of the tides after the meridian passage of the moon, these cycles of bigotry are not always immediate with the economic cycles, but, nevertheless, they seem concomitant with them. I could cite you many instances which seem to bear out this thought, but will not take the time now to do it, except to call attention to the fact that great wars seem to be followed by deep economic depressions, and during these depressions nationals of one nation try to put the blame for the situation on nationals of another nation, and often on minority groups within their own nation.

This latter case is the situation in Germany between the Austrian dictator, Hitler, and native Germans of Jewish religion. Germany had failed in the World War. She had lost her colonies; her Navy lay at the bottom of Scapa Flow; her foreign markets had been taken away; a loaf of bread sold for a billion paper marks; and the financial condition

of the people in general was appalling, so those who had assumed power looked about for a scapegoat. The Jewish element of the German people provided such a scapegoat by the dictatorship and those behind it. Jews had led in steel making, shipping, foreign trade, and domestic commerce out of all proportion to their numbers compared to other Germans; nor were the Jews behind in music, the arts and sciences, and philosophy. This state of affairs first led to jealousy, then to bigotry, and finally to persecution, with all of which the world is familiar.

There could be no escape to asylum elsewhere in the world, though longing eyes were cast on America, since Jewish money and goods had been commandeered by the Nazis, and families once well to do or in comfortable circumstances were herded into ghettos and denied expatriation.

In other generations persecution because of political or religious differences has given some of its best immigrant stock to the United States of America. The Pilgrims and Puritans, Huguenots, Lutherans, and Irish, German, and English Catholics were striking examples. It is also true that love of liberty, freedom of conscience and speech, and a desire to better their economic condition brought many fine men and women to America whose descendants are a credit and an honor to our Nation.

For almost 150 years America has been the haven, the mecca, to which the proscribed, the persecuted peoples of occidental civilization have longed to migrate. Every cycle of bigotry, economic depression, and racial intolerance in continental Europe drove millions to our shores. America, the land of liberty and opportunity; America, the land where they cradled religious respect for all faiths; America, the land of freedom and equality! That America was their destination.

From the west coast of Ireland to the eastern shores of the Black Sea these emigrants sought America. From the White Sea in the north to the Straits of Messina in the Mediterranean they set sail for America. In the last 15 decades America was the one word in the minds and on the tongues of millions of all the nationals within these regions. America, the land of hope and faith; the land where a man could be a man, free and independent, no matter what tongue he spoke or what his racial stock might be; a land where wages were high, worktime short; a land open for settlers, jobs for all workmen; the land of promise and plenty.

So the adventuresome took ship, in the steerage, at as low as \$15 a head, providing their own food and bedding. They came in millions and spread all over the land of plenty, from Maine to Oregon, and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. They built the railroads. They manned the river steamboats. They built the wharves and docks. They did anything to which they could turn their willing hands. Coal and iron mines, rolling mills, textile mills, blast furnaces, coke ovens, tunnels, subways, bridges, roads, commercial and domestic buildings, all these and much more they dug down, laid down, or built up.

All who came to the land of plenty were not brawn; also came brains, fine brains, the seat of great minds. The list is too long to name them here, but Carl Schurz, Joseph Pulitzer, Jacob Schiff, Prof. Abraham Jacoby, Steinmetz, Einstein are not the lowest on the list. A roster of those whose thought, rather than their hands, helped mold this Nation to one of the greatest in the world would fill multiple pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. To this roster would be added many names besides those recorded of the Jewish race, as well as names of Irish, Scotch, Welsh, English, German, French, Italian, Austrian, Hungarian, Polish, Scandinavian, Russian, and Balkan derivation.

There is much discussion these days of the alien immigrants to the United States of America and their effect on the ethical, political, economic, industrial, and employment present-day status of the Nation. Some of this discussion has been vitriolic in its denunciation of the immigrant. In order to get a true viewpoint it may be well to have a look backward at the situation as it existed in the Original Colonies and in the United States of America in the nineteenth century.

America was not settled by a homogeneous race, Nordic or otherwise—the original settlers came from many lands—nor were the English settlers in the various Colonies all of one blood and religious or political thought. Florida was settled by Spaniards, as was California and other parts of the west coast. Louisiana and the lower tributary valleys of the Mississippi were settled by the French, who also penetrated the Great Lakes region, the upper Mississippi region, and the adjacent territory.

Swedes settled in Delaware and along the Delaware River. German colonists occupied the fertile valleys of eastern Pennsylvania, where later they were joined by Scotch-Irish, Irish, English, and Welsh. Scandinavians, including Swedes, Norwegians, and Danes, took possession of fertile homesteads in Delaware, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and the then Territories west. Poles came to Pennsylvania, as did Letts and Lithuanians. New York, originally called New Amsterdam, was settled by Hollanders, Flemings, and Walloons. Massachusetts Bay and Plymouth Colony were settled by English from the southwest of England.

Maryland was settled by English Catholics, Virginia by English Anglicans. Great rivalry existed between these two Colonies, and Maryland still calls itself the free state because of its early attitude toward liberty of conscience and thought. Georgia was founded by James Edward Oglethorpe. It became a refuge for persecuted Protestant sects, then opposed to the Anglican Church, and unfortunate debtors, but worthy classes of England. The early Georgian colonists were English, German Lutherans, Piedmontese, Scottish Highlanders, Swiss, Portuguese, and Jews.

Portuguese and Spanish Jews were among the first settlers of the now exclusive Newport, R. I., and one of the oldest cemeteries in the United States of America is the Jewish Touro Cemetery in Newport. In my district in New York is an ancient Jewish cemetery, just off Sixth Avenue, and another near the Bowery and Chatham Square, containing a few graves of early Manhattan Islanders who were Jews and settled in New York City in 1654.

Persecution is not new in what is now the United States. Witch trials were common in Salem. The ostracism of Roger Williams from Massachusetts founded Rhode Island. Virginia cavaliers harassed the Catholics of Maryland. Anglicans scouted Lutherans. Mormons were driven from Palmyra to Fayette, to Kirtland, to Jackson County, Mo., to Nauvoo, and finally established Utah under Brigham Young.

Persecution need not be physical or depend upon personal harm. It may be by ostracism, terrible to sensitive souls. It may be by boycott. It can take many forms, developed over centuries of practice by baiters of a people whose ideals are not understood by their antagonists. Persecution is not always a conflict of races. It may and has existed between elements of homogeneous races, usually duty to differences in religion and politics.

History repeats itself by generations, by centuries, and by millenia. Thomas Torquemada, the sadistic inquisitor in the Spain of King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella, having driven out the Moors from Spain, turned his attentions to the Jews, and, after royal consent to their expulsion, expatriated 800,000 Jewish families, who fled to Holland, Russia, the Balkans, Italy, the Dutch East Indies, Tunis, Tripoli, Morocco, and other countries that granted them shelter. These countries of refuge profited greatly by the arrival of the new Jewish immigrants, but Spain lost her commanding position among the nations of that time and has been on the downgrade ever since. The great Empire of Spain has disintegrated.

Today in Germany the same conditions obtain that did in Spain under Torquemada. Hitler is the modern Torquemada. Today the same conditions obtaining in Germany under Hitler will produce the same results that occurred in Spain under Torquemada. I repeat this to emphasize it. The next world war will destroy Germany; southern Catholic Germany will secede as a nation from northern Protestant Germany.

Civilization was said to have been thrust into Spain on the point of a Moorish lance. The famous Giralda Tower of Seville was built by the Moors and used by them as an

astronomical observatory. When the Spaniards drove the Moors out they did not know what use to put the beautiful tower to, so they let it stand idle. Much of the so-called kultur of Germany is, like the culture of Spain, not indigenous to German soil but has been borrowed from other sources, with the possible exceptions of Goethe's and Schiller's works.

Prior to 1700 Germany did not figure in the culture of Europe to the extent that she later achieved. The new Europe of the Renaissance was born in Italy, nurtured in France, developed in England, and thence spread to the rest of Europe, Germany being the last to accept the new culture. Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, Raphael, Titian, Dante, Descartes, Rabelais and Montaigne, Columbus, De Gama, Copernicus, Galileo, and Magellan were not German. The mothers of Rabelais and Montaigne were Jewesses.

René Descartes preceded Immanuel Kant as a philosopher, and his work was of great aid to Pascal and Newton, and Descartes was not a German. Immanuel Kant was of Scotch descent. Latins, not Germans, led the way in the new civilization. Dante, Cervantes, Rabelais, Shakespeare, and the lesser authors are well known outside of their native lands, but the best of German poets, Goethe, is not read much outside of Germany. Shakespeare competes with Goethe on the German stage, but Goethe does not compete with Shakespeare on the English-speaking stage. Schiller's dramas deal more with non-German subjects than with those concerning his own nationals. Schopenhauer, Kant, and Nietzsche drew their inspiration from non-German sources. German culture was influenced by foreign sources more than the culture of any other race in Europe.

Baruch Benedict Spinoza, the distinguished Portuguese-Holland Jew, has been the brilliant, gifted, dominating, intellectual figure of German philosophic culture for the past 200 years. Such talented writers as Goethe, Lessing, Schiller, and Herder were inspired by Spinoza's contributions and their works were profoundly influenced by his conceptions and ideals. Nietzsche was of Polish descent. Whenever and wherever we find Nietzsche dilating upon the superior qualities of his superman we find him always drawing his inspiration from the great foreign, oriental prophet of the Persians, Zoroaster. The great pessimist Arthur Schopenhauer was of Dutch descent and propagandized the Buddhist-Hinduistic philosophy into Germany. His object was to replace the Biblical influence of the New and Old Testaments. Neander is universally considered the most distinguished and representative German church historian. He, too, was a baptized Jew. Heinrich Heine, the supreme lyric poet of his day, was a Jew. Karl Marx, the avatar of Soviet Russia and the author of the world-famous *Das Kapital*, was of Jewish extraction. Wassermann, the great serologist; Ehrlich, the world's most famous biochemist; Henle, one of the greatest anatomists of his time; Albert Neisser, the greatest bacteriologist of his day, discoverer of the gonococcus and the leprosy bacillus, were all Jews.

In the realm of physics what names are comparable to the four outstanding Jewish-German physicists, such as Hertz, of the Hertzian or X-ray fame, Helmholtz, Einstein, and Plank. Max Reinhardt, the greatest theatrical impresario, is a representative German member of the Jewish faith. The most important modern German poets, such as Zweig, Werfel, Hoffmannstahl, and Wassermann, are members of the Semetic race. Emil Ludwig and Leon Feuchtwanger are two of the world's most famous modern German-Jewish novelists. The three greatest German publicists of the last century, Maximilian Harder, Alfred Kier, and Ludwig Boerne, were non-Aryans, disciples of Judaism. The founder of Germany's modern merchant marine and the North German Lloyd Steamship Co. was the Jew, Alfred Ballin. The Junker Party, the great political reactionary party of Germany, was founded by a baptized Jew, Fritz Stahl. Mendelssohn is considered one of the most foremost musical composers of the world; he, too, was of Jewish extraction. The greatest tenor that Germany produced in the last 5 decades was Yallowker, a Russian Jew. One of the most brilliant statesmen of modern Germany was the distinguished Rothenau, Minister

of Foreign Affairs, who was assassinated by the Nazis. His father was the founder of the general electric industry of Germany.

A brief cursory of the facts that I have presented proves conclusively that neither German culture, so-called, nor modern German civilization are of purely German creation. German kultur is the cumulative contribution of the creative effort of a conglomeration of different races, religions, and peoples from all over the world, who lived in Germany and were inspired by the creative geniuses of the world to ennoble mankind by the product of their mentality.

A pure-blooded German kultur and civilization is a myth, an aspersion, and an insult upon the intelligence of any liberal-minded citizen of the world.

The list of great ones in German history, in art, music, science, biology, medicine, and surgery is saturated with non-German names and with countless Jewish names too numerous to mention. Because of religious bigotry, intolerance, and racial persecution by Germany's modern Torquemada, Hitler, Germany will disintegrate. Its empire will suffer the fate of medieval Spain. The Prussian-German Empire will be succeeded by a German confederation based on southern Catholic Germany, as Bavaria, Saxony, and Württemberg, united with Austria, of which Vienna may yet be the titular capital. Northern Prussian Germany, or Protestant Germany, has always been militaristically inclined. Prussian Germany has given to Germany its great warriors. It has oppressed its neighbors in war and peace. It has given to a unified Germany the autocracy of the Hohenzollern dynasty, against which Woodrow Wilson and Congress declared war. No great names in science, art, and literature have come from its bowels. On the other hand, southern Germany and the Rhineland have contributed to Germany on the altar of its culture and civilization its most eminent scholars, savants, scientists, musicians, painters, and philosophers.

After the next world war a ring of Catholic nations will surround Prussian-Hitler Germany. Catholic nations, such as Belgium, France, Czechoslovakia, southern Catholic Germany, Austria, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia, will destroy Prussian junkerism, Hitlerism, and militarism and make the world safe for free men to exist.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, on May 17, 1929, a distinguished, gallant, and lovable personage, a Representative of the great Commonwealth of Virginia, the Honorable Henry St. George Tucker, delivered an address in this House on the subject of reapportionment. It was a masterpiece of verbal elegance and forensic legal lore. In his peroration this brilliant scholar stated that—

Children from the sons of the covenant were never intended by our forbears to participate in the Government of the United States.

It was my privilege to respond to that address. When I concluded my remarks that great personality arose and clarified his expressions, so that no one could misconstrue or misinterpret them. It was a sublime effort, worthy of the great statesman that he was. Since that memorable occasion the Honorable Henry St. George Tucker has made his eternal pilgrimage to that "bourne from whence no traveler ever returns." To commemorate that heroic and immortal event in my congressional experience I now desire to call to your attention that address and Mr. Tucker's response thereto. Henry St. George Tucker's answer is a ringing challenge to anti-Semitism, racial bigotry, and religious intolerance wherever it may be found.

The address and response are as follows:

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, the Commonwealth of Virginia has contributed some of the most distinguished names to the history of our Nation. Out of 56 men who signed the Declaration of Independence, 7 of them came from the great Commonwealth of Virginia.

In the early history of our Government the Old Dominion gave four of its most eminent sons as President of the United States—George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and James Monroe. A quartet of famous names that have never been equaled or been surpassed by any State in the Union. [Applause.]

Next to the founder of our country, George Washington, stands the name of Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the great Democratic Party of our Nation.

The life and character of Thomas Jefferson symbolizes, to my mind, all the ideals and virtues that prompted our forefathers to establish this great democratic-republican Government of ours. [Applause.]

When the sage of Monticello passed beyond the Great Divide he left a will in which he requested that when a tombstone was erected to commemorate his memory only three sentiments should be expressed thereon. First, that he was the author of the Declaration of Independence; second, that he was the founder of the University of Virginia; and third, that he was the author of religious liberty and freedom of worship in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

What an extraordinary trinity of ideals to which Thomas Jefferson consecrated his life: First, education; second, the right of worshiping in conformity with a man's own conscience; and third, as author of that immortal document, that great charter of human rights, worthy of God himself, the Declaration of Independence. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, picture to yourselves the modesty of that extraordinary intellectual giant, Thomas Jefferson, the greatest man of his day. He never put upon his tombstone that he was twice President of the United States. He never had inscribed upon his eternal shaft that he was Vice President of the United States. Never did he declare to those who might read his epitaph that he was first Secretary of State in the administration of George Washington. Nor did he state that he was Ambassador of the United States to France and helped to bring to a successful conclusion the great Revolution which brought liberty and freedom to our forbears through the assistance of France in aiding the American cause in its hour of need. [Applause.]

Seven famous names are penned to the great Declaration of Independence from the State of Virginia—George Wythe, Richard Lee, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Harrison, Thomas Nelson, Jr., Francis Lightfoot Lee, and Carter Braxton. Where is there a schoolboy today throughout the length and breadth of our country who has not heard of the militant Maccabean sentiments of Patrick Henry in his clarion call to the people of our Nation when he said, "Give me liberty or give me death"? Such is the contribution of the Commonwealth of Virginia to the early history of our country. [Applause.]

A century has passed since the death of Thomas Jefferson. The great Commonwealth of Virginia has 12 distinguished men who represent that great State in the House and Senate. Let me have them pass before you in panoramic fashion as their names come to my mind. Andrew Jackson Montague, former Governor of Virginia, and named after the militant and aggressive leader of democracy, Andrew Jackson; R. Walton Moore, a descendant of Lewis Morris, the New York signer of the Declaration of Independence, and also a descendant of the Walton family, of New York, a family of merchants in the old days, one of whom was mayor of New York, and all of whom are buried in the churchyard at Trinity Church; Schuyler Bland, Patrick Henry Drewry, Clifton Alexander Woodrum, Senators Carter Glass and Claude Swanson, and last but not least Virginia's illustrious son, Henry St. George Tucker. [Applause.]

Where is there a State in our Union that can match these names for brilliancy in their accomplishments, and for extraordinary manifestations in service to our people? [Applause.]

For 14 decades the distinguished family of Tucker has been represented in the Congress of the United States. The original Thomas Tudor Tucker served as a Member of Congress during the administration of Gen. George Washington. George Tucker, a kinsman of St. George Tucker, our friend's great-grandfather, was a Member of this historic forum. In 1825 Thomas Jefferson appointed him as professor of moral and intellectual philosophy in the University of Virginia. Henry St. George Tucker served from 1815 to 1819 in the Congress of the United States.

Thus we behold the picture of great-grandfather, grandfather, father, and son serving the best traditions of our people and our Nation.

The present Henry St. George Tucker, in my humble opinion, is one of the greatest constitutional lawyers in the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

As former acting president of Washington and Lee University, as former president of the American Bar Association, as a Member of this House on and off since 1889, and as professor of law, he is one of the outstanding and distinguished representatives of the great Commonwealth of Virginia. [Applause.] He comes from the town of Lexington, Va., Lexington that was the home of Robert E. Lee, the illustrious general and distinguished soldier of the Southern Confederacy, Lexington, Va., where that distinguished soldier, Stonewall Jackson, taught mathematics.

In the center of that community is the city of Staunton, which is the birthplace that cradled and nurtured the greatest exponent of the philosophy of democracy, one of the greatest Presidents of all times, Woodrow Wilson. [Applause.]

Since the inception of our Government, four successive generations of Tuckers have represented the State of Virginia in the House. Henry St. George Tucker, the present incumbent, carries in his vest pocket a watch, an heirloom from colonial days, whose ticks and beats were heard by John Randolph, of Roanoke, its original owner. Edmund Randolph, of this distinguished family, was the first Attorney General in the administration of George Washington.

Surely, with all these antecedents that I have enumerated, anything that Mr. Tucker would say on the floor of this House

carries great weight. Our distinguished colleague delivered a speech in this historic forum on the "power of Congress to exclude aliens in the enumeration of the population of the United States for Representatives in Congress." It was a brilliant effort. A masterpiece of forensic lore. A debatable constitutional question. His main contention being that when the Constitution was adopted in 1787 aliens were not present. Therefore he infers they should not be counted now.

As a matter of fact, immediately after the Revolution, proportionate to its population, we had as many aliens then as we have now. In our midst were the Tories, hillbillies, the Hessians, English troops, and other soldiers of fortune, who fought against our forbears in their desire to establish a republican form of government. But when the Constitution was adopted, a general amnesty was declared and everybody was permitted to participate as citizens of our Republic. That was why we had so few aliens.

However, when the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution was passed, after the abolition of slavery in 1868, section 2 declared—

"Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed."

Surely, in 1868 we had millions of aliens then as now, and it was the intention of our forefathers to count all of its people. They left nothing to be inferred and only excluded Indians not taxed. Therefore, it is my contention that an alien is a person under the fourteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, and should be included upon the basis of fixing representation, excluding only "Indians not taxed." As a matter of justice, all the people living in our country are aliens or the descendants of aliens. The only true Americans are the Indians, whom we have deprived of their land and even disfranchised by not permitting them to vote. [Applause.]

While we are on the subject of the aliens I would like to state that there are 45,000,000 people in the United States today who are the sons and descendants of former alien immigrants, who, since their entrance into this country, have contributed to our happiness, glory, and prosperity in times of peace and have fought upon every battlefield in defense of our country in times of war. For almost 100 years these aliens, through their sweat and blood, have helped to build our great American railroads, have perfected our great American industries of steel and iron, have worked in the mills, in the looms, and in the factories. They have gone down into the bowels of the earth to bring forth the hidden mineral resources of our Nation, have dug the subways, have built the great skyscrapers and dwellings, which have made our Nation and our people the most wonderful, the most respected, and the richest of all the world. [Applause.]

Directly in front of the home of the President of the United States there are monuments on each corner erected to perpetuate the name and fame of five aliens who gave up everything they held near and dear to help our Colonial forefathers establish this mighty Republic of ours.

Pulaski, a Polish count, who organized the Foreign Legion, marching these soldiers through Maryland, Virginia, North and South Carolina, fighting all the way for our cause, until he fell wounded in the Battle of Savannah and was buried at sea. Gen. Baron von Steuben, the great German strategist, who trained and disciplined the American soldiers at Valley Forge and made it possible for Washington to win his subsequent victories. Rochambeau, the great French soldier, who, in conjunction with Lafayette and Washington, was responsible in lowering the colors of Cornwallis at Yorktown, that brought victory to the arms of America. Kosciuszko, the great Polish engineer, who designed and built West Point and was wounded at the battlefield of Saratoga, that caused to bring about the defeat of Burgoyne. And last, but not least, the distinguished and gifted General Lafayette, who brought the aid of the French people to the cause of the American Revolution, that made success possible. Everywhere, throughout the length and breadth of our land, there are humble shafts that commemorate the lives of these alien immigrants who worked for our happiness in times of peace and were ready to die for our Republic in times of war. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen, my purpose in addressing the House today is to take exception to the peroration of my distinguished colleague, Mr. Tucker. In his concluding remarks he said "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise were never intended to be given participation in the Government of the United States." If this figure of speech, this Biblical sentiment of Mr. Tucker were literally interpreted, exclusive of its text, it would cast aspersions upon one of the most patriotic and loyal groups of citizens in our country.

Since no religious test is required by our Constitution to hold public office to serve our people, why pick out one group of people and say "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise were never intended to be given participation in the Government of the United States?"

Let me tell my colleague, Mr. Tucker, who these strangers from the covenant of the land of promise are.

For 25 centuries these covenanted people from the land of promise have been persecuted and been proscribed. They have been pillaged. They have been plundered. They have been burned at the stake. They have been driven from the land that God covenanted as their own. As wanderers in the world, they have gone through pogroms, massacres, and inquisitions, and while all these monarchs, emperors, and others who have persecuted them have been forgotten in the ashes of time, these aliens from the

commonwealth of Israel lived on, and will continue to live wherever the influence of civilization and humanity exists, because Judaism stands for three ideals that it has preached from the time of Abraham. First, the belief in one ever-living God. Second, the belief in the inspiration of the Holy Bible containing within it the Ten Commandments given by God to Moses on Mount Sinai. Third, the belief in the immortality of the soul. For these reasons the Jewish race will and must continue to live. [Applause.]

When the Assyrian king destroyed the commonwealth of Israel, many of these people settled in Phoenicia. Prior to the Christian era the Phoenicians were the Yankees of the East. Living near the forests of Lebanon, they hewed down the trees and converted them into ships. They settled in Greece, the lower part of Italy, and particularly Venice, which is called Venetia, derived from Phoenicia, and Carthage.

As their ships plowed through the Mediterranean and through the Straits of Gibraltar, they went to England. There they went down into the mines and brought back tin, which they used to alloy copper, and were among the first bronze makers of the world. It was these Phoenicians, the most civilized and cultured people of their day, who called England British. The term "British" comes from two Hebraic words, "brith", which means covenant and "ish", which means son. Therefore, "British" means the covenanted son.

In 1492 two of these sons of the covenant, Spanish Morranos, Louis St. Angel and Gabriel Sanchez gave 20,000,000 maravedis, which amounts to about \$200,000, to Queen Isabella to finance the expedition of Christopher Columbus. On the three ships, the *Pinta*, the *Niña*, and the *Santa Maria*, that set sail with Columbus for a northwest passage to India were 108 men; 18 of them were Jews—sons of the covenant. Dr. Maestral and Dr. Marco were physician and surgeon, respectively, on the ships. Rodrigo Sanchez was superintendent of the vessels. The first man to sight land was Rodrigo de Triana. The first man to set foot on American soil was Louis de Torres, who Christopher Columbus took along with him to act as interpreter with the Grand Kahn of India. All these men were of Jewish extraction. Jehuda Cresques, a Jew, was the man who perfected the compass for the first time that made it possible for Columbus to sail away from the harbor and guide his destiny. Abraham Cecueto presented Christopher Columbus with the astronomical charts that made it possible for him to follow the North Star and wend his way westward. So you see, fellow Members of the House, it was aliens from the commonwealth of Israel who not only financed the expedition of Columbus but were present with him in those strenuous and frightful months that he must have gone through ere he discovered this wonderful country of ours that our forefathers and divine Providence decreed should be the haven and home for all the oppressed of the world. [Applause.]

When Washington was at Valley Forge, and the cause of the American colonists looked helpless and hopeless, General Washington sent his emissary to one of the sons of the commonwealth of Israel in the person of Chaim Solomon, who was an immigrant from the city of Lodz, Poland. Mr. Solomon was one of the richest men of his time. He took out \$675,000, all the money he had in the world, and sent it to General Washington to help our colonial forbears. For this act of generosity a servant betrayed him to the British. He was imprisoned, court-martialed, and sentenced to be hanged. Chaim Solomon died in prison, but his money helped to save the cause of the American Revolution. This money was never returned to his wife and children, who were left penniless.

In the city of Charleston, S. C., in 1777, Col. Emanuel M. Noah gathered together 100 sons of the covenant, who fought under the leadership of Captain Lushington, with General Moultrie as their presiding officer, all throughout the American Revolution. Since that time the children of Israel—first, last, and all the time true American citizens and patriots—have contributed to every line of human endeavor to make our Nation the greatest, the most glorious in the world. In science, in art, in literature, in philosophy, in journalism, in medicine, in law, in jurisprudence, in banking, and in statesmanship the Jew has contributed his all upon the altar of our Nation. In every war, from the American Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, the allied war, Jewish blood has saturated and hallowed the soil of our country and of Cuba, the Philippines, and France that our institutions might be preserved. [Applause.]

I appeal to you, Mr. Henry St. George Tucker, an illustrious citizen of the State of Virginia, distinguished Member of the greatest representative body in the world, the Congress of the United States, to name any group of citizens within the confines of our country who are more loyal, patriotic, sincere, and devoted to the institutions of our Nation than are the children of the covenant, the Jewish people. [Applause.]

During the Civil War your sainted father was a soldier of the Confederacy. During the darkest hour of this fratricidal war Judah P. Benjamin, a son of Israel, was attorney general, secretary of state, and secretary of war of the southern Confederacy. He dined in your home and took from his back his own coat to give to your honored father. You have served in the Congress of the United States with many men who were members of the Jewish faith, such as Isidore Strauss, who was your devoted friend and broke bread in your home.

In view of the respect and regard that everyone has for you, Mr. Tucker, I contend it is your privilege, nay, I should say it is your duty, in justice to your name and fame, to define what you

meant when you said that—"aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise were never intended to be given participation in the Government of the United States."

[Applause.]

I yield now, for a reply, to my friend from Virginia [Mr. Tucker]. [Applause.]

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly distressed to learn from my eminent and distinguished friend from New York [Mr. Sirovich] that the remark made by me in what was a legal argument has been construed by some a reflection on the great Jewish race. It gives me pain. I know that there is no man who knows me who will say that I ever could have been guilty of such a thing.

Mr. Speaker, I would be false to the tenderest memories of my life, I would be false to some of the most ennobling companionships of my life if I could ever, by word or act, say or do anything to reflect upon the great Hebrew race. [Applause.]

All through my argument I spoke of aliens as "unnaturalized foreigners"—applying to all races. This was a mere figure of speech and in no sense was it intended to diminish the accomplishments of the Hebrew in the march of human progress in science and law, in philosophy and theology, and in the highest development of family life known in American life.

I thank my distinguished friend, Dr. WILLIAM IRVING SIROVICH, for giving me this opportunity to explain the expression used by me in the close of my speech referred to by him. I deeply regret that anyone has seen in that phrase any evidence of any intention to disparage or criticize the Jewish race. Nothing could be further from my thought. No act or word of mine would ever be so construed by you who know me. To do so I would have to forget some of the sweetest friendships and most ennobling associations of my life with Hebrews. The words used were from the Apostle Paul—it was his language, not mine.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to reiterate, in closing, my profound respect for the citizenship of our Nation of every race and creed, and especially for those of the Jewish race. [Applause.]

Mr. SIROVICH. In behalf of the Jewish race I want to thank you for the manly way in which you have corrected the sentiment that you have expressed and for the great regard and respect that you have for the citizenship of the Jewish race.

In this country we pledge allegiance to one flag and to one nation. As an American, I extend to you, Henry St. George Tucker, the hand of brotherly love, and sincerely hope that you will live far beyond the Biblical threescore and ten in happiness and in contentment with your people.

Within the great Liberty Bell in Philadelphia there is a sentiment taken from the Third Book of the Holy Testament which says: "Thou shalt proclaim liberty and freedom to all the inhabitants of this land." When that bell rang it spread liberty and freedom to all the people of our country. Your manly and courageous sentiments today will bring happiness and contentment to the descendants "from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise." [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, all religions are the result of the accident of birth, place, time, and circumstance, modified by the racial tendencies of the peoples among whom the worship arose. The solitary Jehovah of the Jews, the Trinity of the Christians, the polytheism of the gods of ancient Greece, and of surviving Buddhism and Brahmanism; Mohammed, the prophet of Moslemism; Confucius, the analector and interpreter of ethics; the Code of Hammurabi; the Great Spirit of the North American Indian; the many gods of the Mayans, Toltecs, and Incas; Mithraism, Molochism, idolism, fetishism, totemism, and all the varieties of figure worship had their beginning and continued being in the search of many peoples for knowledge of a supreme being, of an all-powerful one, omnipotent in all things, as revealed to them by one or more prophets of their own race or adjacent races. That such conditions continue to exist through milleniums indicates that the true God cares little about the form of worship, over which mankind has fought so long and bitterly. Bigotry and intolerance are solely human characteristics and have no place in the truly divine scheme of things. The true God is so tolerant that it behooves humanity to imitate this quality of godliness. Let every true American, therefore, be ever ready to offer up everything he holds near and dear in life to bring about the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT IN MISSOURI

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, cash receipts from the sale of principal farm products in Missouri increased from \$158,702,000 in 1932 to \$238,363,000 in 1935, including \$23,397,000

in rental and benefit payments. This is an increase of 50 percent.

Price changes on certain selected commodities, which brought about a considerable share of the increased cash receipts to which I have just referred, are shown in the following table:

TABLE 1.—Average prices received by Missouri farmers for commodities listed on dates specified

Commodity	Aug. 15, 1932	Mar. 15, 1933	Dec. 15, 1935
	Cents	Cents	Cents
Wheat.....per bushel..	39	39	91
Corn.....do.....	31	20	61
Oats.....do.....	15	17	34
Barley.....do.....	26	28	57
Rye.....do.....	37	39	62
Buckwheat.....do.....		40	57
Flaxseed.....do.....	68	80	125
Potatoes.....do.....	45	55	80
Sweetpotatoes.....do.....	80	55	90
Cotton.....per pound..	6.5	5.3	11.2
Hogs.....per hundredweight..	410	325	880
Beef cattle.....do.....	530	400	740
Veal calves.....do.....	470	495	880
Lambs.....do.....	440	440	920
Milk cows.....per head..	2,900	2,500	4,200
Chickens.....per pound..	10	7.2	14.8
Eggs.....per dozen.....	11.8	7.4	25.5
Butter.....per pound..	20	17	30
Wool.....per pound, unwashed..	9	9	25
Apples.....per bushel..	65	115	80

For the United States as a whole the yearly average price of all groups of farm products increased from 65 percent to 108 percent of the pre-war level during the period 1932-35, an increase of 66 percent. The low point occurred in March, 1933, when prices were only 55 percent of the pre-war level, whereas in December, 1935, they averaged 110 percent of that level. These figures do not include rental and benefit payments. The gain in exchange value of farm products per unit was somewhat less than the gain in farm prices, since prices farmers pay for commodities used in living and production also advanced about 17 percent during the period. The exchange value per unit of farm products increased from 61 percent of the pre-war level in 1932 to 86 percent in 1935, a gain of about 41 percent.

FARM REAL-ESTATE APPRECIATION

A new appreciation of farm real estate in Missouri has been one result of increased farm income. The number of forced farm sales per thousand declined from 59.8 for the year ending in March, 1933, to 35.8 for the year ending in March, 1935. Voluntary sales and trades of farms for the year ending in March, 1932, stood at a low of 18.2 per thousand compared with 22.6 per thousand for the year ending in March, 1935. For the first time since 1920 the decline in value of farm real estate per acre halted in the year ending March, 1933, when it hit a low of 55, the State average value from 1912 to 1914 being 100. From this low of 55 in 1933 the estimate value per acre rose to 58 for the year ending March, 1935.

IMPROVED CONDITIONS FOR HIRED FARM LABOR

Estimates by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics indicate that on January 1, 1933, the demand for farm labor in Missouri was 53 percent below the standard accepted as normal and the supply 24 percent above. At the same time the average farm wage rate per person with board was \$16.25. Three years later, in January, 1936, the farm-labor demand was only 27 percent below normal, and supply was 4 percent below. The average farm wage rate per person with board was \$18, having advanced 11 percent above its 1933 level.

SOIL-CONSERVATION PRACTICES UNDER THE A. A. A.

The programs of agricultural adjustment, from their launching in the spring of 1933, were concerned with good use of the land of cooperating farmers, as well as with adjustment of crop acreage in line with effective demand. Farm leaders and administration officials recognized from the start that relieving a proportion of farm land from the soil-exhausting burden of major crop production created an

unprecedented opportunity for putting this land to the soil-conserving uses which farm specialists for many years have been advocating.

Adjustment contracts include provisions encouraging beneficial uses for acreage taken out of surplus crops. The first corn-hog contract, offered farmers in 1934, authorized use of the rented acreage only "for planting additional permanent pasture; for soil-improving and erosion-preventing crops not to be harvested; for resting or fallowing the land; for weed eradication; or for planting farm wood lots." The cotton contract for 1934-35 specified use of the rented acres only for "soil-improving crops; erosion-preventing crops; food crops for consumption by the producer on his farm; feed crops for the production of livestock or livestock products for consumption or use by the producer on his farm; or fallowing; or such other uses as may be permitted by the Secretary of Agriculture or his authorized agent." Food and feed crops for home use were authorized on rented acres in the South, because it was recognized that the standard of farm living in that region, which contains half of the farm population of the country, might thereby be improved. The tobacco and wheat contracts carried similar provisions.

In the 1934 crop year, the first in which the adjustment programs were in full swing, farmers agreed to shift their production on nearly 36,000,000 acres. These acres represented one out of every nine of cultivated land in the country. Of the shifted acres it has been estimated that about one-third was put in pasture or meadow crops, one-third in acres of emergency forage crops and in crops that supplied food and feed for home use, and the remaining one-third was fallow to conserve moisture and control weeds, planted to farm wood lots, or left idle. Farmers in Missouri shifted nearly 1,344,000 acres from the production of corn, cotton, wheat, and tobacco in 1934.

A marked trend toward increased pasturage of all kinds is apparent in Missouri. According to the Bureau of the Census, the acreage devoted to pasturage increased by about 3,241,000 acres from 1929 to 1934.

DAIRY CATTLE DISEASE ERADICATION

Milk has been an important source of farm income in Missouri. For the past few years more than \$25,000,000 has been returned to milk producers annually. They are therefore interested in steps taken by the Government to safeguard the health of their herds.

Approximately \$50,000,000 of Agricultural Adjustment Administration funds have been made available for cattle disease eradication in the United States, primarily bovine tuberculosis, Bang's disease, and mastitis. This work is being done in cooperation with the Bureau of Animal Industry. As of December 31, 1935, some 1,447,700 head of cattle had been given the tuberculin test and about 308,690 the agglutination test for Bang's disease. Of the \$350,000 allocated the State for the eradication of bovine tuberculosis, \$342,570.55 had been expended in indemnities and operating expenses at the close of 1935. Of the \$966,000 allotment to the State for the eradication of Bang's disease, \$867,500 had been spent in indemnities and operating expenses through December 1935.

EXTENT OF FARMER PARTICIPATION IN ADJUSTMENT PROGRAMS

From the inauguration of the adjustment programs in 1933 through January 6, 1936, 279,773 contracts signed by Missouri farmers were accepted by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. Of this number of contracts 201,372 were corn-hog, 46,439 were wheat, 29,855 were cotton, 2,106 were tobacco, and 1 was rice.

Missouri farmers have evidenced their cooperation in A. A. A. programs by their votes in five referendums on these and related measures. During the first 2 weeks of October 1934, corn-hog producers were asked whether they favored an adjustment program for 1935. In this referendum Missouri producers numbering 34,319 voted for a program, while 19,342 voted against.

In the Bankhead referendum conducted on December 14, 1934, to decide upon the applicability of the Bankhead Act to the 1935-36 cotton crop, 12,466 votes were cast in the State, of which 10,552 favored application of the act. A Nationwide wheat referendum was conducted on May 25, 1935, in

which producers were asked, "Are you in favor of a wheat-production program to follow the present one, which expires with the 1935 crop year?" In Missouri, 18,913 votes were cast, of which 15,647, or 83 percent, favored such a program. During the summer of 1935, producers of different types of tobacco were asked whether they favored a production-adjustment program to follow the one which expired with the crop year 1935. Burley producers in Missouri favored a program for 1936 by a vote of 647 to 126. The last referendum in this State was conducted on October 26, 1935, in which corn-hog producers were asked whether they favored a corn-hog program for 1936. Official returns indicated that 69,391 favored such a program, while 9,386 opposed.

RENTAL AND BENEFIT PAYMENTS IN MISSOURI

As of December 31, 1935, rental and benefit payments in Missouri aggregated \$42,522,601.29. Of this amount cooperating corn-hog farmers received \$32,834,304.31; cotton raisers, \$5,277,584.36; wheat growers, \$4,128,541.49; tobacco producers, \$280,238.07; and rice farmers, \$1,933.06.

Until January 6, 1936, funds to provide these rental-benefit payments were raised through processing taxes. As of December 31, 1935, processing-tax collections made in Missouri totaled \$38,574,390.76. Processing taxes were collected through the medium of first processors, or converters of the raw agricultural products—millers, packers, cotton, and tobacco manufacturers—wherever these processing establishments were located. They were paid by consumers throughout the country wherever the processed articles were sold.

FARMERS' MONEY GOES TO TOWN

The increased income of cotton, corn-hog, tobacco, and wheat farmers did not remain out in the country where those products were raised. The farmers' money found its way to town and to the industrial centers of the country, where it put people to work.

The extent to which increased farm income during the past 3 years enabled farmers to increase their purchases of city-made goods and services is reflected in several ways.

New automobile registrations in Missouri were approximately as follows:

1932	46,663
1933	54,308
1934	68,505
1935	91,115

The increase from 1932 to 1935 was 95 percent.

According to Automobile Facts and Figures, a publication of the Automobile Manufacturers' Association, the 1934 retail automobile sales gain in Missouri was greatest in small towns and on farms. From 1933 to 1934 new-passenger-car registrations on farms and in towns under 10,000 in population, increased 31 percent, whereas in cities over 10,000 the increase was 18 percent.

New-automobile purchases, among other things, have meant an increased gasoline consumption. In Missouri consumption rose from 458,672,000 gallons in 1932 to 489,401,000 gallons in 1934, and to 509,061,000 gallons in 1935. From 1932 to 1935 the increase amounted to 11 percent.

Fertilizer tax tag sales indicate that 32,422 equivalent tons of fertilizer were purchased in Missouri in 1933. During 1934 sales increased to 52,259 equivalent tons, and during 1935 to 59,398. The increase from 1933 to 1935 was 83 percent.

Improved banking conditions are further indications of increased business activity. Monthly statements issued by the Federal Reserve System indicate that debits to individual accounts increased greatly from 1932 to 1935. For 1932, debits in the St. Louis district amounted to \$7,831,981,000, and for 1934 they advanced to \$8,491,398,000. Preliminary figures indicate that for 1935 they increased to \$9,666,517,000, or 23 percent over the 1932 figure.

Individual deposits, including savings, time, and commercial deposits, in banks in Missouri, aggregated \$921,587,000, an advance of \$171,244,000, or 22 percent for the year closing June 29, 1935, in comparison with the year ending June 31, 1933, according to reports received by the American Bankers' Association.

The number of all commercial failures showed a rapid decline from 1932 through 1935. From 713 such failures in Missouri in 1932 the figure dropped to 198 in 1934 and to 163 in 1935. Hence, commercial failures in the latter year amounted to 23 percent of those in 1932.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the reading of the Journal and other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, under the peculiar circumstances that have been submitted to me by the gentleman from Missouri I shall not object, but already we have an hour and a half of time devoted to speeches on Monday. That is Consent Calendar day and a great many Members are anxious to have that calendar considered. The gentleman from Missouri has advised me that it is barely possible he may not have to leave the city and for that reason I shall not object to his request, but I shall be compelled to object to any other requests so far as Monday is concerned.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may say that if we get a lot of speeches on Monday we will save the country a lot of money.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NELSON]?

There was no objection.

POSTMASTER GENERAL FARLEY AT GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a speech made by the Postmaster General at Grand Rapids, Mich., to the Michigan State postmasters' convention.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following address by the Postmaster General at the State convention of Michigan postmasters, Grand Rapids, Mich., Wednesday, May 20, 1936, at 4 p. m.:

It is indeed a pleasure to participate with the postmasters of Michigan at a meeting of this nature. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your splendid organization, which is most helpful, not only to the postmasters but to the Postal Service generally throughout the State.

Many of the postmasters assembled here today received their appointments through President Roosevelt, and it gives me particular pleasure to bring to you the personal greetings and best wishes of our great leader, whom history will record as one of the most humane and understanding of all our Presidents.

It is my feeling that you should, and I am quite sure that you do, cherish the opportunity to serve under such capable leadership. The President has a keen personal interest in the affairs of the Post Office Department and he fully appreciates the great service that is being rendered by this, the largest and most far reaching in its influence, of all of the Government departments.

Postmasters must be great believers in organization. Postal employees' organizations and gatherings are of themselves most beneficial and worth while to both the employees and the Postal Service, and it is through postmasters' conventions of this kind that new ideas and plans are exchanged, all of which have as their sole object the rendering of a more efficient service to the patrons of the Post Office Department.

The employees in all branches of the Service have contributed in no small degree to the many improvements that have been made in the Postal Service. Their alertness and sense of responsibility have been an important factor in the according of the prompt and efficient service which the Post Office Department is rendering to the American public every minute of the day and night.

It costs approximately \$700,000,000 a year to operate the Postal Service, and approximately \$4,000 is paid into post offices each minute of every business day by those who use its facilities. Last year the Department handled over 22,000,000,000 pieces of mail.

Owing to their intimate relationship to the interests of all of the people, postal receipts are most indicative of changing business conditions and trends. For that reason the volume of matter coming into the mails, as shown by postal receipts, has long been regarded as a most reliable barometer of business conditions.

Business throughout the country is steadily improving and your own State of Michigan is among those States that are setting the pace. One has only to glance at the daily newspapers to be apprised of the marked improvement in conditions throughout the Nation, and this upward swing is best attested to by the increasing volume of postal receipts.

As representatives of the Postal Service in this great State, I feel sure that you will be most pleased to know that postal receipts in Michigan for the first 4 months of the present calendar year were \$7,355,000, as compared with but \$6,741,000 for the same period a year ago. This represents a gain of more than 9 percent, which is the best indication of the steady improvement in business and industry that has and is now taking place in every section of this State.

For the month of April just passed, postal receipts for Michigan amounted to \$1,930,000, as against \$1,769,000 for April 1935, also a gain of more than 9 percent.

Here in Grand Rapids the postal receipts for the first 4 months of this year were \$405,416, in comparison with receipts of \$376,874 for the first 4 months of 1935, or an increase of more than 7 percent.

The preliminary report of postal receipts for the month of April, covering the entire country, shows a gain of more than 8 percent over the same month a year ago, and for the first 10 months of the current fiscal year a gain of approximately 7 percent over the same period in 1935 is reflected. I have every reason to believe that the final report for the year will reveal an even greater increase.

These increases in postal receipts in Michigan and throughout the country have not been confined to the metropolitan and industrial areas. It was only a few days ago that I had the pleasure of advancing 532 fourth-class post offices to the Presidential grade as a result of increased postal receipts which placed them within that category. Of these 532 post offices throughout the country which were thus advanced, 17 were here in the State of Michigan.

I feel that you will concur with me in my belief that the 40-hour-week law for postal employees, which it was my pleasure to endorse prior to its passage during the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, has largely solved what was a very acute problem regarding substitute employees. Before its enactment we had a large number of substitutes who had for years waited in vain for regular appointments. These substitutes have now, in most instances, obtained regular jobs and regular positions have been provided for many others who were unemployed. Nothing since I became Postmaster General has given me more happiness and satisfaction than the relief which has come to these faithful employees. In this connection, I want to commend the postmasters for the careful supervision that they have exercised in the application of the 40-hour-week law, which has in no way interrupted or impaired the Postal Service.

In addition to rendering improved service to the patrons of the Postal Service, the Department has, within the past 3 years, conducted a vigorous and widespread campaign to protect the people of the country from numerous fraudulent enterprises conducted through the mails. Investigations into these fraudulent schemes of varying natures were made by the Postal Inspection Service and wherever the facts warranted, fraud orders denying the use of the mails to the perpetrators were promptly issued. It is a certainty that the issuance of these orders has saved the American public millions of dollars annually. Reports of post-office inspectors in only 47 of the mail-fraud investigations brought to a close during the past fiscal year by the arrest, indictment, or conviction of the swindlers involved, revealed a loss to the victims of the schemes of \$49,000,000. There has also been conducted a vigorous and successful drive on the senders of obscene matter.

There has been a steady improvement and development of the Air Mail Service since the first air-mail route was established between Washington and New York in 1918, but it is within the past 2 years that the greatest strides have been made in the Air Mail Service.

The present domestic air-mail system, which was set up in the spring of 1934, is the finest in the history of the service, embracing as it does 29,000-route and 40,000,000-scheduled miles. Under the old system which was in operation prior to 1934, there were but 25,248-route and 35,000,000-scheduled miles. At the present time, 215 cities throughout the Nation have direct air-mail service as compared with 167 cities under the former system. Before 1934 the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and West Virginia had no air-mail service whatever, whereas today these States are traversed by routes, which form an integral part of the new air-mail system, which serves directly 46 States and indirectly the remaining two.

The cost to the Post Office Department of this new and greatly improved air-mail system for the fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1935, was \$8,880,000, and it is estimated that the cost for the present fiscal year, including \$1,300,000 allowed by the Interstate Commerce Commission for increased compensation to the air-mail contractors, will be approximately \$12,000,000. In 1933, the fiscal year prior to the establishment of the present system, the cost of the air-mail service was \$19,400,000 for a much more limited service than is available today.

All records for the volume of mail transported by air, passengers carried, passenger-miles flown, and pounds of air express carried were broken last year, and present indications are that these records will again be bettered this year. Planes flying over the Post Office Department's domestic and foreign air-mail system last year

carried more than thirteen and one-half million pounds of air mail, a gain of 76 percent over 1934, and more than 863,000 passengers, a gain of 53 percent. The passenger revenues of the air-mail companies for the calendar year 1935 amounted to more than \$15,800,000 as compared with passenger revenues for 1934 of about \$8,600,000, or an increase of 83 percent.

The most recent and certainly one of the most significant developments in the history of mail transportation was the inauguration of the trans-Pacific air-mail service last November, when the first scheduled flight on the Post Office Department's 8,700-mile air-mail route between San Francisco and the Orient took off from the Alameda, Calif., airport.

The establishment of this great transoceanic service across the broad expanse of the Pacific Ocean by way of Honolulu, Midway, Wake, Guam, and the Philippine Islands has reduced the time consumed in transporting mail from the United States to the Far East from 18 days to but 5½ days.

Plans for the inauguration of a similar transoceanic air-mail service across the Atlantic are now being formulated and there is every reason to believe that the first experimental flights between the United States and Europe will be conducted this summer.

The Post Office Department, in addition to its strictly postal operations, has been called upon several times within the past 3 years to assist other Government departments and agencies. The recent enactment of the veterans' bonus-payment legislation provides for the handling of the payment of the bonus bonds through the Post Office Department and, in accordance with this provision of the law, post offices at the principal points throughout the country are now being designated for this purpose.

Grand Rapids is one of the 12 post offices in Michigan that have been selected as direct bonus-payment offices. The 11 other Michigan post offices selected are Bay City, Battle Creek, Dearborn, Detroit, Flint, Jackson, Kalamazoo, Lansing, Muskegon, Pontiac, and Saginaw.

Plans for a prompt and expeditious handling of these bonds are now being completed. Payment on the bonus bonds becomes effective by law on June 15, 1936, on and after which date they will be received at the 45,000 post offices of the first, second, third, and fourth classes throughout the Nation. After a thorough study of the situation, I am convinced that it will be possible, through the cooperation of the Post Office and Treasury Departments and the veterans themselves, to make payment on the great majority of these bonds within 1 week after June 15, the first date of payment.

Payment of the bonus bonds will be made only after the proper identification and certification by the veterans. The payments will be made by Government check, and in the larger cities this will be done directly through the local post office. In the smaller communities the bonds will be forwarded immediately to a designated central post office within the State for payment by mail.

It is my intention that the handling of these bonus bonds be accomplished without inconvenience to the veterans and with a minimum of delay. Complete instructions as to the method of handling the bonus bonds will be forwarded to postmasters within the near future. On June 13 I plan to deliver, over a Nation-wide radio hook-up, a special message to the veterans, in which I will convey to them full and complete information concerning payment of the bonds and what they will be required to do in identifying themselves.

Among the several nonpostal operations which the Department performs for other Government departments and agencies are the handling of internal-revenue stamps for the Treasury Department and migratory-bird-hunting stamps for the Department of Agriculture.

In March of last year United States savings bonds were placed on sale at post offices throughout the country for the Treasury Department. The Post Office Department, as you all know, handles all the transactions involved in the sale of these bonds with the exception of payment, which is made through the Treasury Department direct. For the first 9 months of this sale, bonds with a maturity value of \$200,000,000 were sold to the public through the various post offices of the country.

Time will not permit even a reference to all of the improvements that have been made in the Postal Service nor to the many functions of the Post Office Department, such as the Railway Mail Service, the Rural Delivery Service, the Parcel Post Service, the Star Route Service, and the like, all of which have played such a prominent role in the expansion and development of the United States Postal Service, and, indeed, the country itself.

The success that has been achieved in providing better postal service to the people of the country is due chiefly to the earnest efforts and loyalty of those who make up our great organization.

In my official capacity as Postmaster General I am required to do extensive traveling. Wherever I have gone I have availed myself of the opportunity to visit the post offices and have personally greeted thousands of our employees. In this way I have learned at first hand of the problems of the Department and our employees throughout the Nation. Of course, I am delighted with the progress that has been made in the Postal Service under the Roosevelt administration. The morale of the Department has never been finer in our whole history.

Needless to say, I fully appreciate the splendid cooperation of the postmasters and all our postal employees for the unwavering support which they have extended to me since I became Postmaster General. I shall never forget the loyalty and devotion which they exhibited under trying conditions a few years ago when business

conditions made it necessary for us to enforce certain restrictions regarding employment.

In conclusion, I wish to express my grateful thanks to you and to the postal employees everywhere for all they are doing to make the United States Postal Service the greatest in all the world.

THE SALES DEPARTMENT OF THE LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, farmers and producers of livestock, from colonial times to the present, learned that it was of great importance to sell their stock at points where the greatest buying competition could be obtained. At an early date in our history, the public livestock market was created by the producers, themselves, and developed and maintained by their patronage and support. It has proven to be the most practical and efficient marketing system yet devised.

EARLY HISTORY OF THE MARKET

About the middle of the eighteenth century, a market which is still in operation was established at Brighton, Mass. As the frontier was extended westward after the Revolutionary War, stockmen and farmers established similar markets at convenient and strategic points. They would drive their stock on the hoof to these markets where buyers from many parts of the surrounding country gathered to bid for the animals. Just before the Civil War, for instance, many such markets developed around Chicago. In 1865 these were consolidated to form the Chicago Union Stockyards, which have been in operation continuously since that time.

As livestock production moved on westward and railroads were extended into the Middle West and Far West, other public markets were established, including the one at South St. Paul, Minn., which next year will celebrate its fiftieth year of operation.

NEED OF SALES DEPARTMENT

Producers early recognized the need for skilled salesmen to cope with the expert buyers representing packers and others. This need gave rise to the commission firm and selling agencies. These selling agencies provided expert salesmanship, offering to producers the services of men thoroughly trained and experienced and as capable of feeling the pulse of the trade as the buyers themselves. In short, the public market, with its facilities for buying and selling, its keen competition and its alert, aggressive salesmen to represent producers, became the sales department of the livestock industry and so continues to this day. No manufacturer would think of giving his whole attention merely to the production of goods but would organize a strong sales department to dispose of the product of his factories, and that, in effect, is what the livestock producers of the country have done in setting up and maintaining public markets for their stock.

No other form of marketing has been found which affords the producers the buying competition or the selling efficiency which the public market offers; nor does any other system provide the protection and safeguards to producers which Federal and State supervision gives, together with the voluntary rules and bonding practices of concerns doing business on the public markets.

THE STOCKYARDS' FUNCTION

The function of the stockyards company is to provide the chutes, pens, scales, feeding, watering, and other handling services necessary in loading and unloading stock. These various facilities are made available every day in the year by the stockyards company, while they never engage in buying or selling any livestock or having any part in the transactions between buyers and sellers. This is a phase of the public-market system which is frequently misunderstood and misrepresented.

The investment in the stockyards property necessary to provide these facilities is large. The company's two principal sources of revenue to meet these costs are from feed

and yardage charges, which charges must be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Since the livestock industry is the backbone of Northwest agriculture, and that agriculture, in all its phases, is the basis of business prosperity in that region, its welfare is of paramount interest to all citizens. The patronage of the public market must be maintained, its personnel must have continued developments and its functions must become more widely known and used.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION HAS MEANT MUCH TO THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include correspondence upon the subject of the bill under discussion this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, how much correspondence is there?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe I might say I will include a part of one or two letters.

Mr. RICH. It will be confined to a page or not more than a page?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the further and increased development of vocational education certainly has much to commend it to the membership of this House. The program has been most successful and has brought material benefit to not only youthful groups of students but to the older folk as well. This measure provides for a permanent system, and our Federal assistance will mean that the various States can continue their activities in agricultural education, home-economic training, and scientific instruction in trades and vocations.

I am particularly interested in the good which is being accomplished in West Virginia through the avenue of vocational education. I have had much correspondence which is interesting and indicative of the need and popularity of this type of training. I shall, however, invite your attention to short excerpts from two communications which I have received.

The first comes from my good friend and distinguished educational leader, the Honorable J. F. Marsh, president of Concord State Teachers College, West Virginia. Under date of May 1 he writes as follows:

Having served for many years as State director of vocational education, I am in a position to appreciate the great need and the value of that special type of training, especially in these times of so much vocational need on the part of young folks.

West Virginia is the largest bituminous-coal-producing State in the Nation, and located within my district at West Virginia University is the school of mines. Its director, Mr. Charles E. Lawall, wrote me on May 4 the following:

This bill would aid vocational education in the State of West Virginia and would particularly aid mining-extension work, as we are now conducting it throughout the State. We here in the school of mines are particularly interested in its passage.

I need not tell you about the work that the mining-extension department has been doing throughout the State of West Virginia for the past 24 years, because I am aware that you are familiar with it. We have already had over 25,000 men in our mining-extension classes since this work was started. The work this year will be conducted at three centers throughout the State so that it will be available to practically every mining man that wants to take this work. During the past year we have had enrolled in our evening mining classes 1,657 men throughout the State, so we feel that this work is reaching those men for whom it is primarily intended.

Money spent through the vocational education program will be returned in the form of citizenship dividends to our Republic. Our boys and girls and men and women will be better equipped for life's work.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LANHAM, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. BROOKS, for 5 days, on account of illness.

HOOR OF MEETING MONDAY

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that several special orders have been granted for next Monday, and our desire to get through the Consent Calendar as far as possible, I have conferred with the minority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House meet at 11 o'clock on Monday next.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may say to the majority leader that it is well to convene early on Monday if an hour and a half is to be taken up with special orders, but just remember that every day you keep this House in session it is going to be detrimental to the welfare of this country; and I want to warn the majority leader he should get Congress out of here just as quickly as possible.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the majority leader inform us whether it is contemplated to bring up any suspensions on Monday following the Consent Calendar?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that is a matter entirely within the discretion of the Speaker, and I have not consulted with him; but I know of none at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the House meet at 11 o'clock on Monday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution authorizing the appointment of a joint committee of Congress to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect on January 20, 1937; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3118. An act to provide for the creation of the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial National Monument, on Put in Bay, South Bass Island, in the State of Ohio, and for other purposes;

S. 4023. An act to provide for the continuation of trading in unlisted securities upon national securities exchanges, for the registration of over-the-counter brokers and dealers, for the filing of current information and periodic reports by issuers, and for other purposes; and

S. 4448. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the issuance of the charter to the city of Lynchburg, Va.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on May 25, 1936, present to the President, for his approval bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 8069. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. S. Mull;

H. R. 8599. An act to provide for a change in the designation of the Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection, to create a marine casualty investigation board and increase efficiency in administration of the steamboat-inspection laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8766. An act to authorize municipal corporations in the Territory of Alaska to incur bonded indebtedness, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11747. An act extending the time for making the report of the commission to study the subject of Hernando De Soto's expedition; and

H. J. Res. 439. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the Department of Labor Building of a memorial to the officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and Immigration Border Patrol who, while on active duty, lost their lives under heroic or tragic circumstances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 27, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARING

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, room 445, will hold public hearings at 10 a. m., Wednesday, May 27, on a group of private bills relating to fraudulent birth certificates and visas at time of entry.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

852. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the latest report of the Commission, entitled "The Textile Industries in the First Half of 1935, Part I, the Cotton Textile Industry", was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Committee on Mines and Mining. H. R. 12374. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of unemployment through the performance of useful public work, and for other purposes", approved March 31, 1933; without amendment (Rept. No. 2779). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 50. Concurrent resolution expressing the appreciation of Congress for a bequest of a collection of naval and other medals from the late Dr. Malcolm Storer, of Boston, Mass.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2780). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 589. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the transportation of bonded merchandise by other than common carriers under certain conditions; without amendment (Rept. No. 2781). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FADDIS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 11419. A bill to establish additional national cemeteries; with amendment (Rept. No. 2785). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 4457. An act authorizing the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the third circuit; without amendment (Rept. No. 2786). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 10313. A bill to provide for hurricane control in the Gulf of Mexico and environs during the hurricane season; with amendment (Rept. No. 2787). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3043. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern district of Georgia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2788). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FADDIS: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 4390. An act to amend the National Defense Act relating to the Medical Administrative Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 2789). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 12793. A bill to amend certain administrative provisions

of the internal-revenue laws, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2818). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2127. An act to amend section 4471 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2819). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. HARTER: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 4115. An act for the relief of Charles D. Birkhead; without amendment (Rept. No. 2783). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FADDIS: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 823. An act for the relief of Benjamin H. Southern; without amendment (Rept. No. 2784). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 864. A bill for the relief of Bernard Knopp; with amendment (Rept. No. 2790). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 890. A bill for the relief of Oscar L. McCallen; with amendment (Rept. No. 2791). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EKWALL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2120. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles F. Carter, parents and guardians of Louise Marie Carter, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 2792). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5618. A bill for the relief of Floyd Gatton; with amendment (Rept. No. 2793). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5759. A bill for the relief of Marie B. Neale; with amendment (Rept. No. 2794). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5829. A bill for the relief of Daniel J. Hagerty; with amendment (Rept. No. 2795). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7209. A bill for the relief of Nannie D. Harding; with amendment (Rept. No. 2796). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. NICHOLS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7361. A bill for the relief of Mary W. Carson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2797). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7496. A bill for the relief of William E. Jones, Walter M. Marston, William Ellery, Richard P. Hollowell, 2d, and Malcolm Donald as executors under the will of Frank W. Hollowell; and Malcolm Donald as executor under the will of Gordon Donald; with amendment (Rept. No. 2798). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8257. A bill for the relief of Catherine T. McNally; with amendment (Rept. No. 2799). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARLSON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9191. A bill for the relief of the dependents of James B. Kiley; without amendment (Rept. No. 2800). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9390. A bill for the relief of Walter T. Karshner, Katherine Karshner, Anne M. Karshner, and Mrs. James E. McShane; with amendment (Rept. No. 2801). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SOUTH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9502. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. J. Nolan, L. Jacobson, J. A. Higuera, C. H. Damsted, R. Galle-guillo, F. G. Grigsby, K. H. Johnson, R. Dupouy, C. J. Degen, W. L. Nolan, R. C. Jensen, M. J. Roderick, L. K. Moore, C. Lederer, M. Kelley, R. Dinkel, A. J. Mouchou, C. B. Taylor,

M. Knull, S. W. Ligon, C. C. Johnson, W. P. Brennan, C. F. Siebert, and J. T. Weeks; with amendment (Rept. No. 2802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11123. A bill for the relief of Edward A. Foote, Jr., and others; with amendment (Rept. No. 2803). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11668. A bill to credit the account of Everett P. Sheridan; with amendment (Rept. No. 2804). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 12522. A bill for the relief of Grier-Lowrance Construction Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. S. 1435. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Elizabeth Kurau; without amendment (Rept. No. 2806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 3371. An act for the relief of John Walker; with amendment (Rept. No. 2807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. S. 3441. An act for the relief of C. T. Hird; with amendment (Rept. No. 2808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EKWALL: Committee on Claims. S. 3607. An act for the relief of T. H. Wagner; with amendment (Rept. No. 2809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EKWALL: Committee on Claims. S. 3608. An act for the relief of Vinson & Pringle; with amendment (Rept. No. 2810). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARLSON: Committee on Claims. S. 3824. An act for the relief of Maud Kelley Thomas; without amendment (Rept. No. 2811). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. S. 4052. An act for the relief of W. D. Gann; with amendment (Rept. No. 2812). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 4140. An act for the relief of Homer Brett, Esq., American consul at Rotterdam, Netherlands, as a result of money stolen from the safe of the American consulate; with amendment (Rept. No. 2813). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. S. 4233. An act for the relief of William H. Brockman; without amendment (Rept. No. 2814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 4379. An act for the relief of the Indiana Limestone Corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 2815). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. S. 4444. An act directing the Court of Claims to reopen certain cases and to correct the errors therein, if any, by additional judgments against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2816). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 12730. A bill to authorize the payment of an annuity to William H. Moran, Chief of the Secret Service Division of the Treasury Department, upon his retirement, in recognition and appreciation of his services to the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2817). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11867. A bill for the relief of Michael E. Sullivan; with amendment (Rept. No. 2820). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 12847) to provide further for the national defense; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAY: A bill (H. R. 12848) to provide an additional place of holding terms of the United States District Court in the Eastern District of Kentucky, and to amend section 83 of the Judicial Code as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 12849) to penalize procuring of or attempts to procure the escape of any prisoner in the custody of an officer of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LORD: A bill (H. R. 12850) authorizing the Interstate Bridge Commission of the State of New York and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the West Branch of the Delaware River between a point in the vicinity of the village of Hancock, Delaware County, N. Y., and a point in the town of Buckingham, Wayne County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOODWIN: A bill (H. R. 12851) authorizing the Interstate Bridge Commission of the State of New York and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Delaware River between points in the village of Barryville, Sullivan County, N. Y., and the village of Shohola, Pike County Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARTLEY: A bill (H. R. 12852) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of material to the sea scout department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Belleville, N. J.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 12853) to amend the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933 in order further to provide for emergency loans to farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 12869) to liberalize the provisions of Public Law No. 484 Seventy-third Congress, to effect uniform provisions in laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, to extend the Employees' Compensation Act with limitations to certain World War veterans and other persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Resolution (H. Res. 525) requesting certain information from the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK: Resolution (H. Res. 526) providing for consideration of H. R. 6427, a bill to prohibit statements and publications advocating overthrow of the Government by violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLAND: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 597) authorizing an investigation by the Bureau of Fisheries of the California sardine (pilchard) fishing industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 598) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxing of income; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 599) to provide for the appointment of a committee to study the question of Puerto Rican independence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. IGLESIAS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 600) to provide for the appointment of a commission to study the economic and social conditions prevailing in Puerto Rico and inquire into present and future political and economic relations between the United States and Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. NORTON (by request): Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 601) to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the committee on inaugural ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1937; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), joint resolution (H. J. Res. 602) to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies in 1937; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), joint resolution (H. J. Res. 603) to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also (by request), joint resolution (H. J. Res. 604) authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FISH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 605) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to expend funds of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for participation by the United States in the 1936 Sixth World's Poultry Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, regarding a tariff duty on coconut oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY: A bill (H. R. 12854) for the relief of Joseph D. Gigante; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 12855) for the relief of Bridget Della Cawley Ebbale; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COSTELLO: A bill (H. R. 12856) for the relief of Vincent Ford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURLEY: A bill (H. R. 12857) for the relief of Raymondo Bentivegna; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DELANEY: A bill (H. R. 12858) for the relief of Fannie Sarah Platt; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EKWALL: A bill (H. R. 12859) to correct the immigration status of Joseph Bryan Grant Ingoldsby; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: A bill (H. R. 12860) for the relief of Victor Engstrand, father of Darwin Engstrand, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONAGHAN: A bill (H. R. 12861) for the relief of Burr A. Davison; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 12862) for the relief of Rachel or Rachel Bursk; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 12863) for the relief of George T. Stonebraker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 12864) for the relief of Gus Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 12865) for the relief of Ralph Hart; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 12866) for the relief of Manuel Joaquim Ferreira; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEWART: A bill (H. R. 12867) for the relief of John W. Watson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCHER: A bill (H. R. 12868) for the relief of Fred Robert Craig; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10977. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging the Congress of the United States to afford the privilege of entry into this country to those

persons who are being discriminated against and persecuted in Germany on religious or racial grounds, by a suspension of the present immigration laws for a period of 2 years with reference to such persons; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

10978. Also, petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to make the Civilian Conservation Corps permanent; to the Committee on Labor.

10979. By Mr. DEBOUEN: Petition of the Louisiana Cattlemen's Association, adopted at their May 14, 1936, meeting at Lake Charles, La.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10980. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the New York State Legislature, urging that the tariff duty on coconut oil should not be reduced below a minimum of 3 cents a pound; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10981. By Mr. FORD of California: Resolution of the city planning commissioners of the city of Los Angeles, endorsing the housing bill (S. 4424) of Senator WAGNER; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10982. By Mr. GAVAGAN: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, regarding a tariff on coconut oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10983. By Mr. HILDEBRANDT: Resolution of the Faulk County Board of County Commissioners, Faulkton, S. Dak., urging that additional appropriations be made for continuing the works of the Resettlement Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10984. Also, resolution of the Wilson Townsend Club, of Mitchell, S. Dak., relative to Townsend investigating committee; to the Committee on Rules.

10985. By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: Petition signed by 197 voting citizens of Meigs County, Ohio, opposing the granting of discretionary power to any department in connection with the deportation of aliens at present residing illegally in the United States and urging that influence be exerted against the passage of the Dickstein and Kerr-Coolidge bills and that all possible be done to pass the Dies bill (H. R. 5921); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

10986. Also, petition signed by 65 voters and railroad employees of Ironton and Coal Grove, Ohio, and 7 voters and railroad employees of Columbus, Ohio, requesting Members of the Seventy-fourth Congress to use their best efforts to secure the enactment of the Wheeler-Crosser bills (S. 4174 and H. R. 11609); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10987. By Mr. KENNEDY of New York: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, regarding a tariff on coconut oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10988. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of New York, Albany, that tariff duty on coconut oil should not be reduced below a minimum of 3 cents a pound; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10989. Also, petition of the Navy Post, No. 16, American Legion, New York, urging support of House bills 11681 and 11682; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

10990. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition signed by Dr. Coughlin and 20 residents of Harvard, Ill., requesting passage of House bill 11609 and Senate bill 4174; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10991. Also, petition signed by Ruth Livingston, president, Harvard (Ill.) Townsend Club, No. 1, and by 56 members of the club, requesting passage of House bill 7154; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10992. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of Farmers and Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, of Saginaw, Mich., endorsing Senate bills 4423 and 4560, and House bills 12225 and 12295; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10993. By Mr. SISSON: Petition of the board of directors, Utica Chamber of Commerce, opposing tax legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10994. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Tennessee Federation of Labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.